

FEDERAL REGISTER

VOLUME 27

NUMBER 109

Washington, Wednesday, June 6, 1962

Contents

Agricultural Marketing Service

RULES AND REGULATIONS:	
Fruit grown in California:	
Elberta peaches; regulation by grades and sizes.....	5329
Plums; regulation by sizes.....	5330
Grapefruit grown in Indian River District, Florida; handling; undershipments.....	5329
Tomatoes; importation.....	5330

Agricultural Research Service

NOTICES:	
Organization, functions and authorities.....	5348

Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service

PROPOSED RULE MAKING:	
Milk in Greater Boston, Springfield, and Worcester, Massachusetts; Southeastern New England; and Connecticut marketing areas; recommended decision.....	5335

RULES AND REGULATIONS:	
Feed grain program, 1962; barley; California and New York.....	5329
Tobacco (type 62 shade-grown cigar-leaf) grown in designated production area of Florida and Georgia; expenses and rate of assessment; correction.....	5331

Agriculture Department

See Agricultural Marketing Service; Agricultural Research Service; Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service.

Air Force Department

RULES AND REGULATIONS:	
Aircraft arresting systems.....	5331
Medical, dental, and veterinary care from civilian sources.....	5331

Civil Aeronautics Board

NOTICES:	
No-show rule; notice of prehearing conference.....	5351

Civil Service Commission

RULES AND REGULATIONS:	
Defense Department; exceptions from competitive service.....	5329

Commerce Department

See Maritime Administration.

Defense Department

See Air Force Department.

Federal Aviation Agency

NOTICES:	
General Aviation District Office, Sioux Falls, South Dakota; notice of closing.....	5351

PROPOSED RULE MAKING:	
Revocation of restricted areas, Federal airways and control area extensions; alteration of Federal airways and control areas.....	5341

RULES AND REGULATIONS:	
Lighter-than-air pilot certificates; miscellaneous amendments; correction.....	5331

Federal Communications Commission

NOTICES:	
Domestic Telegraph Service; memorandum opinion and order instituting investigation.....	5353

Hearings, etc.:	
Ceracche & Co., Inc.....	5351
Currence, Warren J.....	5352
Laramie Community TV Co. et al.....	5352
New York Penn Microwave Corp.....	5352

PROPOSED RULE MAKING:	
Aeronautical multicom station; establishment of new class of station.....	5345
Airborne doppler radars; deletion of temporary provision.....	5347
Civil air patrol stations in the United States; use of certain frequency.....	5346
Television broadcast stations in Puerto Rico; table of assignments.....	5347

RULES AND REGULATIONS:	
Frequency allocations and radio treaty matters; radio equipment list.....	5334

Federal Maritime Commission

NOTICES:	
Agreements filed for approval:	
American President Lines, Ltd., et al.....	5355
Atlantic Passenger Steamship Conference et al.....	5355
Exclusive patronage (dual rate) contracts; amended notice of filing:	
Canal, Central America North-bound Conference.....	5356
Pacific Coast/Caribbean Sea Ports Conference.....	5356

Federal Power Commission

NOTICES:	
Hearings, etc.:	
Graham-Michaelis Drilling Co. et al.; correction.....	5357
Michigan Wisconsin Pipe Line Co.....	5356
United Gas Pipe Line Co.....	5356

RULES AND REGULATIONS:	
Organization; revised statement; correction.....	5331

Federal Reserve System

NOTICES:	
Continental Bank and Trust Co.; order continuing date for show cause hearing.....	5357

Interior Department

See also Land Management Bureau; Reclamation Bureau.

NOTICES:	
Bonneville Power Administration; negotiation of contracts for experimental supplies and equipment for direct-current test line and terminals; correction.....	5348
Commissioner, Bureau of Indian Affairs, and Area Director, Gallup Area Office, Bureau of Indian Affairs; delegation of authority to negotiate contracts for construction work.....	5348

(Continued on next page)

Interstate Commerce Commission

NOTICES:

Fourth section applications for relief.....	5380
Loaded grain cars destined to Texas gulf ports for export, holding at holding point; investigation and suspension....	5379
Motor carrier:	
Alternate route deviation notices.....	5360
Applications and certain other proceedings (2 documents)....	5360, 5362
Transfer proceedings.....	5359

Land Management Bureau

RULES AND REGULATIONS:

California; order opening public lands.....	5334
---	------

Maritime Administration

NOTICES:

Chief, Office of Ship Construction; delegation of authority..	5350
---	------

Reclamation Bureau

NOTICES:

Columbia Basin Project, Washington; public announcement of sale of full-time farm units....	5348
---	------

Securities and Exchange Commission

NOTICES:

Hearings, etc.:

Consolidated Natural Gas Co. et al.....	5357
Imperial Mining, Inc.....	5358

Tariff Commission

NOTICES:

Certain provisions of the Tariff Schedules of the United States; notice of hearing and opportunity to present written views..	5359
---	------

Codification Guide

The following numerical guide is a list of the parts of each title of the Code of Federal Regulations affected by documents published in today's issue. A cumulative list of parts affected, covering the current month to date, appears at the end of each issue beginning with the second issue of the month.

Monthly, quarterly, and annual cumulative guides, published separately from the daily issues, include the section numbers as well as the part numbers affected.

5 CFR

6.....	5329
--------	------

7 CFR

775.....	5329
912.....	5329
917 (2 documents).....	5329, 5330
980.....	5330
1195.....	5331

PROPOSED RULES:

1001.....	5335
1006.....	5335
1007.....	5335
1014.....	5335
1015.....	5335

14 CFR

22.....	5331
---------	------

PROPOSED RULES:

600.....	5341
601.....	5341
608.....	5341

18 CFR

3.....	5331
--------	------

32 CFR

825.....	5331
890.....	5331

43 CFR

PUBLIC LAND ORDERS:

125 (see PLO 2689).....	5334
948 (see PLO 2689).....	5334
2689.....	5334

47 CFR

2.....	5334
--------	------

PROPOSED RULES:

2 (3 documents).....	5345-5347
3.....	5347
9 (3 documents).....	5345-5347

FEDERAL REGISTER

Telephone

Worth 3-3261

Published daily, except Sundays, Mondays, and days following official Federal holidays, by the Office of the Federal Register, National Archives and Records Service, General Services Administration, pursuant to the authority contained in the Federal Register Act, approved July 26, 1935 (49 Stat. 500, as amended; 44 U.S.C., ch. 8B), under regulations prescribed by the Administrative Committee of the Federal Register, approved by the President. Distribution is made only by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C.

The FEDERAL REGISTER will be furnished by mail to subscribers, free of postage, for \$1.50 per month or \$15.00 per year, payable in advance. The charge for individual copies (minimum 15 cents) varies in proportion to the size of the issue. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, directly to the Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C.

The regulatory material appearing herein is keyed to the CODE OF FEDERAL REGULATIONS, which is published, under 50 titles, pursuant to section 11 of the Federal Register Act, as amended August 5, 1953. The CODE OF FEDERAL REGULATIONS is sold by the Superintendent of Documents. Prices of books and pocket supplements vary.

There are no restrictions on the republication of material appearing in the FEDERAL REGISTER, or the CODE OF FEDERAL REGULATIONS.

Rules and Regulations

Title 5—ADMINISTRATIVE PERSONNEL

Chapter I—Civil Service Commission

PART 6—EXCEPTIONS FROM THE COMPETITIVE SERVICE

Department of Defense

Effective upon publication in the FEDERAL REGISTER, subparagraph (6) is added to paragraph (a) of § 6.104 as set out below.

§ 6.104 Department of Defense.

(a) *Office of the Secretary.* * * *
(6) Director of Policy Review, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (International Security Affairs).

(R.S. 1753, sec. 2, 22 Stat. 403, as amended; 5 U.S.C. 631, 633)

UNITED STATES CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,

[SEAL] MARY V. WENZEL,
Executive Assistant to the Commissioners.

[F.R. Doc. 62-5468; Filed, June 5, 1962; 8:48 a.m.]

Title 7—AGRICULTURE

Chapter VII—Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service (Agricultural Adjustment), Department of Agriculture

SUBCHAPTER D—SPECIAL FEED GRAIN PROGRAM [1962 Feed Grain Program, Supp. 1, Amdt. 3]

PART 775—FEED GRAINS

Subpart—1962 Feed Grain Program Regulations

BARLEY; CALIFORNIA AND NEW YORK

Section 775.152, of the 1962 Feed Grain Program Regulations, Supplement 1 (27 F.R. 160 and 164) is amended by adding county average yields and payment rates for barley for Alpine County, California, and Albany County, New York.

Section 775.152 is amended by adding county average yields, county minimum payment rates (50 percent payment rate per acre), and additional acre payment rates (60 percent payment rate per acre) for barley as follows:

CALIFORNIA				
District	County	1959-60 average yield	50 percent payment rate per acre	60 percent payment rate per acre
6-----	Alpine-----	<i>Bushels</i> 40.0	\$19.80	\$23.80
NEW YORK				
6-----	Albany-----	<i>Bushels</i> 32.0	\$16.60	\$20.00

(Sec. 16(d), 49 Stat. 1151, as amended; 16 U.S.C. 590 p.)

Effective date: Date of publication.

Issued at Washington, D.C., this 1st day of June 1962.

ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,
Secretary.

[F.R. Doc. 62-5493; Filed, June 5, 1962; 8:52 a.m.]

Chapter IX—Agricultural Marketing Service (Marketing Agreements and Orders), Department of Agriculture

PART 912—GRAPEFRUIT GROWN IN THE INDIAN RIVER DISTRICT IN FLORIDA

Undershipment

Notice was published in the FEDERAL REGISTER issue of April 25, 1962 (27 F.R. 3923), that the Department was giving consideration to a proposed addition to the rules and regulations (Subpart—Rules and Regulations, 7 CFR 912.120; 27 F.R. 92) currently in effect pursuant to the applicable provisions of the marketing agreement and Order No. 912 (7 CFR Part 912; 27 F.R. 87), regulating the handling of grapefruit grown in the Indian River District in Florida, effective under the applicable provisions of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended (7 U.S.C. 601-674).

After consideration of all relevant matters presented, including the proposal set forth in the aforesaid notice which was submitted by the Indian River Grapefruit Committee, established under said marketing agreement and order as the agency to administer the terms and provisions thereof, it is hereby found that the addition, as hereinafter set forth, to the said rules and regulations is in accordance with the provisions of said marketing agreement and order and will tend to effectuate the declared purposes of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended. Such addition is hereby approved and the regulatory provisions of § 912.51 of the said marketing agreement and Order No. 912 are modified by the following new section:

§ 912.140 Undershipment.

If any person handles during any week a quantity of grapefruit, covered by a regulation issued pursuant to § 912.47, in an amount less than the total allotment available to him for such week, he may handle, during the next succeeding week, a quantity of grapefruit, in addition to that permitted by the allotment available to him for such week, equivalent to such undershipment or 25 percent of the allotment issued to him for the week during which the undershipment was made, whichever is the lesser.

(Secs. 1-19, 48 Stat. 31, as amended; 7 U.S.C. 601-674)

Dated June 1, 1962, to become effective 30 days after publication in the FEDERAL REGISTER.

PAUL A. NICHOLSON,
Deputy Director, Fruit and Vegetable Division, Agricultural Marketing Service.

[F.R. Doc. 62-5489; Filed, June 5, 1962; 8:52 a.m.]

[Elberta Peach Reg. 1]

PART 917—FRESH BARTLETT PEARS, PLUMS, AND ELBERTA PEACHES GROWN IN CALIFORNIA

Regulation by Grades and Sizes

§ 917.307 Elberta Peach Regulation 1.

(a) *Findings.* (1) Pursuant to the marketing agreement, as amended, and Order No. 917, as amended (7 CFR Part 917), regulating the handling of fresh Bartlett pears, plums, and Elberta peaches grown in the State of California, effective under the applicable provisions of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended (7 U.S.C. 601-674), and upon the basis of the recommendations of the Elberta Peach Commodity Committee, established under the aforesaid amended marketing agreement and order, and upon other available information, it is hereby found that the limitation of shipments of Elberta peaches, as hereinafter provided, will tend to effectuate the declared policy of the act.

(2) It is hereby further found that it is impracticable, unnecessary, and contrary to the public interest to give preliminary notice, engage in public rule-making procedure, and postpone the effective date of this section until 30 days after publication thereof in the FEDERAL REGISTER (5 U.S.C. 1001-1011) in that, as hereinafter set forth, the time intervening upon which this section is based became available and the time when this section must become effective in order to effectuate the declared policy of the act is insufficient; a reasonable time is permitted, under the circumstances, for preparation for such effective time; and good cause exists for making the provisions hereof effective not later than June 15, 1962. A reasonable determination as to the supply of, and the demand for, such peaches must await the development of the crop and adequate information thereon was not available to the Elberta Peach Commodity Committee until May 18, 1962; recommendation as to the need for, and the extent of, regulation of shipments of such peaches was made at the meeting of said committee on May 18, 1962, after consideration of all available information relative to the supply and demand conditions for such peaches, at which time the recommendation and supporting information were

submitted to the Department; shipments of the current crop of such peaches are expected to begin on or about June 15, 1962, and this section should be applicable to all shipments of such peaches in order to effectuate the declared policy of the act; and compliance with the provisions of this section will not require of handlers any preparation therefor which cannot be completed by the effective time hereof.

(b) *Order.* (1) During the period beginning at 12:01 a.m., P.s.t., June 15, 1962, and ending at 12:01 a.m., P.s.t., November 2, 1962, no shipper shall ship:

(i) Any package or container of Elberta peaches unless such peaches meet the requirements of the U.S. No. 1 grade: *Provided*, That with respect to ripe Elberta peaches, a tolerance of 10 percent, by count, for bruises not causing serious damage is allowed in addition to the tolerances provided for such U.S. No. 1 grade;

(ii) Any package or container of Elberta peaches unless at least 85 percent, by count, of such peaches are well matured (as such term is defined in subparagraph (2) of this paragraph);

(iii) Any package or container of Elberta peaches containing more than one peach which is immature: *Provided*, That no lot of packages or containers of Elberta peaches may be shipped if more than one-half of one percent, by count, of the peaches in the lot are immature; or

(iv) Any package or container of Elberta peaches unless at least 85 percent of the Elberta peaches contained in such package or container measured not less than 2 3/8 inches in diameter: *Provided*, That, Elberta peaches (a) when packed in a 12B California peach box, which are of the size that will pack, in accordance with the requirements prescribed for a standard pack, 65 peaches in said box, or (b) when packed in either a No. 26 standard lug box or a No. 27 standard lug box, which are of the size that will pack, in accordance with the requirements prescribed for a standard pack, not more than 80 peaches in the respective lug box, shall be deemed to meet the said minimum diameter requirement: *And provided, further*, That for the purpose of determining whether ripe Elberta peaches meet the said standard pack requirements, such peaches may be fairly tightly packed rather than tightly packed.

(2) Peaches which are "well matured" means peaches which, at the time of picking, (i) are not hard; (ii) have shoulders and sutures well filled out; (iii) when ring cut, have flesh that separates from the pit readily and cleanly, and is red colored next to the pit; and (iv) have skin and flesh yellowish green to yellow in color. "Peaches which are not hard" yield to moderate pressure at least slightly at the suture and tip and at least very slightly elsewhere.

(3) Section 917.143 sets forth the requirements with respect to the inspection and certification of shipments of Elberta peaches. Such section also prescribes the conditions which must be met if any shipment is to be made without prior inspection and certification. Not-

withstanding that shipments may be made without inspection and certification, each shipper shall comply with all grade and size regulations applicable to the respective shipment.

(4) Terms used in the amended marketing agreement and order shall, when used herein, have the same meaning as given to the respective term in said amended marketing agreement and order; "U.S. No. 1," "bruises," "defects," "damage," "serious damage," "standard pack," "tightly packed," and "fairly tightly packed" shall have the same meaning as when used in the United States Standards for Peaches (§§ 51.1210 to 51.1223 of this title); "No. 26 standard lug box" and "No. 27 standard lug box," respectively, shall have the same meaning as set forth in section 828.4 of the Agricultural Code of California; "No. 12B California peach box" shall have the same meaning as set forth in section 828.25 of the Agricultural Code of California; and "diameter" shall mean the distance through the widest portion of the cross section of a peach at right angles to a line running from the stem to the blossom end.

(Secs. 1-19, 48 Stat. 31, as amended; 7 U.S.C. 601-674)

Dated: June 1, 1962.

PAUL A. NICHOLSON,
Deputy Director, Fruit and
Vegetable Division, Agricultural
Marketing Service.

[F.R. Doc. 62-5490; Filed, June 5, 1962;
8:52 a.m.]

[Plum Order 2; Amdt. 1]

PART 917—FRESH BARTLETT PEARS, PLUMS, AND ELBERTA PEACHES GROWN IN CALIFORNIA

Regulation by Sizes

(a) Findings. (1) Pursuant to the marketing agreement, as amended, and Order No. 917, as amended (7 CFR Part 917), regulating the handling of fresh Bartlett pears, plums, and Elberta peaches grown in the State of California, effective under the applicable provisions of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended (7 U.S.C. 601-674), and upon the basis of the recommendations of the Plum Commodity Committee, established under the aforesaid amended marketing agreement and order, and upon other available information, it is hereby found that the limitation of shipments of plums, in the manner herein provided, will tend to effectuate the declared policy of the act.

(2) It is hereby further found that it is impracticable, unnecessary, and contrary to the public interest to give preliminary notice, engage in public rule-making procedure, and postpone the effective date of this amendment until 30 days after publication thereof in the FEDERAL REGISTER (5 U.S.C. 1001-1011) in that, as hereinafter set forth, the time intervening between the date when information upon which this amendment is based became available and the time when this amendment must become effective in order to effectuate the declared

policy of the act is insufficient; and this amendment relieves restrictions on the handling of plums grown in California.

(b) It is, therefore, ordered that the provisions of paragraph (b)(2) of § 917.302 (Plum Order 2; 27 F.R. 4729) are hereby amended to read as follows:

(2) During each day of the period beginning at 12:01 a.m., P.s.t., June 5, 1962, and ending at 12:01 a.m., P.s.t., November 1, 1962, any shipper may ship from any shipping point a quantity of such plums, by number of packages or containers, which are of a size smaller than the size prescribed in subparagraph (1) of this paragraph if said quantity does not exceed sixty-six and two-thirds (66 2/3) percent of the number of the same type of packages or containers of plums shipped by such shipper which meet the size requirements of said subparagraph (1) of this paragraph: *Provided*, That the individual packages or containers of such smaller plums in each lot of such plums handled shall not exceed two-thirds (2/3) of the total packages or containers of plums in such lot, and: *Provided further*, That all such smaller plums meet the following requirements:

(i) Such plums are of a size that, when packed in a standard basket, they will pack at least a 5 x 5 standard pack;

(ii) The diameters of the smallest and largest plums in the package or container do not vary more than one-fourth (1/4) inch: *Provided*, That a total of not more than five (5) percent, by count, of the plums in the package or container may fail to meet this requirement.

(c) Nothing contained herein shall be construed (1) as affecting or waiving any right, duty, obligation, or liability which has arisen or which, prior to the effective time of the provisions hereof, may arise in connection with any provisions of said Plum Order 2; or (2) as releasing or extinguishing any violation of Plum Order 2 which has occurred or which, prior to the effective time of the provision hereof, may occur.

(Secs. 1-19, 48 Stat. 31, as amended; 7 U.S.C. 601-674)

Dated: June 4, 1962, to be effective on and after 12:01 a.m., P.s.t., June 5, 1962.

PAUL A. NICHOLSON,
Deputy Director, Fruit and
Vegetable Division, Agricultural
Marketing Service.

[F.R. Doc. 62-5549; Filed, June 5, 1962;
8:53 a.m.]

[Tomato Reg. 7, Amdt. 1]

PART 980—VEGETABLES; IMPORT REGULATIONS

Tomatoes

Pursuant to the requirements of section 8e (7 U.S.C. 608e) of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended (Secs. 1-19, 48 Stat. 31, as amended; 7 U.S.C. 601-674) the regulation, published in the FEDERAL REGISTER April 12, 1962 (27 F.R. 3507), restricting the importation of tomatoes is hereby amended as set forth below.

Order, as amended. In § 980.200 Tomato Regulation No. 7 (27 F.R. 3507), delete paragraphs (d) and (e), and substitute new paragraphs (d) and (e), as follows:

§ 980.200 Tomato Regulation No. 7.

(d) *Designation of Governmental inspection services.* The Federal or the Federal-State Inspection Service, Fruit and Vegetable Division, Agricultural Marketing Service, United States Department of Agriculture, and the Fruit and Vegetable Division, Production and Marketing Branch, Canada Department of Agriculture, are hereby designated as governmental inspection services for the purpose of certifying the grade, size, quality, and maturity of tomatoes that are imported, or to be imported, into the United States under the provisions of section 8e of the act.

(e) *Inspection and official inspection certificates.* (1) Inspection by the Federal or Federal-State Inspection Service, by the Fruit and Vegetable Division, Production and Marketing Branch, Canada Department of Agriculture, or by such other governmental inspection service as may be designated, or approved, by the Director, Fruit and Vegetable Division, Agricultural Marketing Service, with appropriate evidence thereof in the form of an official inspection certificate issued by the respective service and applicable to a particular shipment of tomatoes, is required. Each such lot shall be made available and accessible for inspection. Such inspection and certification will be made available in accordance with the rules and regulations governing inspection and certification of fresh fruits, vegetables and other products (Part 51 of this title). Since inspectors may not be stationed in the immediate vicinity of some smaller ports of entry, importers of uninspected and uncertified tomatoes should make advance arrangements for inspection by ascertaining whether or not there is an inspector located at their particular port of entry. For all ports of entry where an inspection office is not located, each importer must give the specified advance notice to the applicable office listed below prior to the time the tomatoes will be imported.

Ports	Office	Advance notice
All Texas points.	W. T. McNabb, P.O. Box 111, 222 McClendon Bldg., 305 E. Jackson St., Harlingen, Tex. (Tel. Garfield 3-5644).	1 day.
All Arizona points.	R. H. Bertelson, 136 Grand Ave., P.O. Box 1646, Nogales, Ariz. (Tel. Atwater 7-2902).	Do.
All California points.	Carley D. Williams, 294 Wholesale Terminal Bldg., 784 S. Central Ave., Los Angeles 21, Calif. (Tel. Madison 2-8756).	3 days.
New York City.	Edward J. Beller, 346 Broadway, Room 306, New York 13, N.Y. (Tel. Recor 2-8000, Ext. 807).	1 day.
All other points.	E. E. Conklin, Chief, Fresh Products Standardization and Inspection Branch, Fruit and Vegetable Division, AMS, Washington 25, D.C. (Tel. Dudley 8-5870).	3 days.

(2) Inspection certificates shall cover only the quantity of tomatoes that is being imported at a particular port of entry by a particular importer.

(3) The inspections performed, and certificates issued, by the Federal or Federal-State Inspection Service, or the Fruit and Vegetable Division, Production and Marketing Branch, Canada Department of Agriculture, shall be in accordance with the rules and regulations of the Department governing the inspection and certification of fresh fruits, vegetables and other products (Part 51 of this title). The cost of any inspection and certification shall be borne by the applicant therefor.

(4) Each inspection certificate issued with respect to any tomatoes to be imported into the United States shall set forth, among other things:

- (i) The date and place of inspection;
- (ii) The name of the shipper, or applicant;
- (iii) The commodity inspected;
- (iv) The quantity of the commodity covered by the certificate;
- (v) The principal identifying marks of the containers;
- (vi) The railroad car initials and number, the truck and trailer license number, the name of the vessel, or other identification of the shipment; and
- (vii) The following statement, if the facts warrant: Meets U.S. Import requirements under section 8e of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937.

This amendment facilitates the importation of tomatoes in the United States from Canada by permitting the Canadian Inspection Service to certify that tomatoes being imported from Canada meet the requirements of this section. Accordingly, notice of rule making and publication procedure hereon are unnecessary and impractical and there is no reason to postpone the effective date of this amendment beyond June 2, 1962 (5 U.S.C. 1001-1011).

Dated: June 1, 1962, to become effective June 2, 1962.

FLOYD F. HEDLUND,
Director, Fruit and Vegetable
Division, Agricultural Mar-
keting Service.

[F.R. Doc. 62-5491; Filed, June 5, 1962; 8:52 a.m.]

Chapter X—Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service (Marketing Agreements and Orders), Department of Agriculture

PART 1195—TYPE 62 SHADE-GROWN CIGAR-LEAF TOBACCO GROWN IN DESIGNATED PRODUCTION AREA OF FLORIDA AND GEORGIA

Subpart—Expenses and Rate of Assessment

Correction

In F.R. Doc. 62-5312, appearing at page 5076 of the issue for Wednesday, May 30, 1962, the last word in the sixth line of the last paragraph presently reading "section" is changed to read "action".

Title 14—AERONAUTICS AND SPACE

Chapter I—Federal Aviation Agency [Reg. Docket No. 1201; Amdt. 22-13; Supp. 3]

PART 22—LIGHTER-THAN-AIR PILOT CERTIFICATES

Miscellaneous Amendments; Correction

On May 17, 1962, Amendment 22-13 to Part 22 of the Civil Air Regulations was inadvertently published in the FEDERAL REGISTER (27 F.R. 4663) without an effective date. This amendment is hereby corrected to include the statement: "This amendment shall become effective May 17, 1962."

Issued in Washington, D.C., on May 29, 1962.

N. E. HALABY,
Administrator.

[F.R. Doc. 62-5470; Filed, June 5, 1962; 8:48 a.m.]

Title 18—CONSERVATION OF POWER

Chapter I—Federal Power Commission

SUBCHAPTER A—GENERAL RULES

PART 3—ORGANIZATION

[Docket No. R-214; Order No. 245]

Correction

MAY 16, 1962.

Order No. 245, Adopting Revised Statement of Organization (18 CFR Part 3), issued April 30, 1962 and published in the FEDERAL REGISTER, May 4, 1962 (F.R. Doc. 62-4354; 27 F.R. 4276): Under § 3.5 *Delegations of final authority* paragraph (a)(18) correct " * * * protests on petitions to intervene * * *" to read " * * * protests or petitions to intervene * * *".

JOSEPH H. GUTRIDE,
Secretary.

[F.R. Doc. 62-5449; Filed, June 5, 1962; 8:45 a.m.]

Title 32—NATIONAL DEFENSE

Chapter VII—Department of the Air Force

SUBCHAPTER B—AIRCRAFT

PART 825—AIRCRAFT ARRESTING SYSTEMS

SUBCHAPTER G—PERSONNEL

PART 890—MEDICAL, DENTAL, AND VETERINARY CARE FROM CIVILIAN SOURCES

1. In Subchapter B, a new Part 825 is added as follows:

- Sec.
825.1 Purpose.
825.2 Use of arresting systems by non-U.S. Government aircraft.

AUTHORITY: §§ 825.1 and 825.2 issued under sec. 8012, 70A Stat. 488; 10 U.S.C. 8012.
SOURCE: AFR 55-42, Jan. 4, 1962.

§ 825.1 Purpose.

Sections 825.1 and 825.2 outline the responsibilities for operating aircraft arresting systems at Air Force installations and joint-use civil airports.

§ 825.2 Use of arresting systems by non-U.S. Government aircraft.

Arresting systems installed by the Air Force at Air Force or joint-use airfields in the United States or overseas may be used in an emergency, at the pilot's request, by non-U.S. Government aircraft. The Air Force will accept no liability for damages resulting from attempted engagement by such aircraft.

2. In Subchapter G, Part 890 is revised to read as follows:

- Sec.
890.1 Purpose.
890.2 Definitions.
890.3 Policies.
890.4 Care authorized from civilian sources.
890.5 For whom authorized.
890.6 Who authorizes.
890.7 When not authorized.
890.8 Emergencies.
890.9 Eye refractions obtained by individuals.
890.10 Surgical and orthopedic appliances.
890.11 Information required on statements and bills from civilian hospitals, physicians, dentists, and nurses.
890.12 Veterinary care authorized.
890.13 When to authorize civilian veterinary care.
890.14 Bills for veterinary service.

AUTHORITY: §§ 890.1 to 890.14 issued under sec. 8012, 70A Stat. 488; 10 U.S.C. 8012. Interpret or apply 10 U.S.C. 672(d), 8721-8723, 9385.

SOURCE: AFR 160-53, Dec. 22, 1961.

§ 890.1 Purpose.

Sections 890.1 to 890.14 tell how to authorize and reimburse at Air Force expense for:

(a) Essential medical and dental care from civilian sources for Air Force members on active duty where Government facilities are unavailable;

(b) Supplemental medical care necessary for uniformed service members while under treatment at Air Force medical treatment facilities; and

(c) Veterinary service for Air Force-owned animals when Government veterinary service is unavailable.

§ 890.2 Definitions.

For the purpose of §§ 890.1 to 890.14, the following terms will apply:

(a) *Civilian medical care.* Physical examination, professional advice, and treatment provided by a civilian physician or civilian medical agency to sick or injured military personnel. The term includes nursing, hospital care, medicine, whole blood or blood derivatives, laboratory and X-ray services, physical therapy, etc.

(b) *Civilian physician.* Any person legally qualified and licensed without limitation to administer drugs and to

perform surgical procedures in the geographic area where such service is provided.

(c) *Civilian dentist.* Any person legally qualified and licensed without limitation in the geographic area concerned to administer drugs and to perform all procedures related to the teeth, jaws, and structures contiguous to one or the other.

(d) *Emergency care.* Medical or dental care required to save life, limb, sight, or to prevent undue suffering.

(e) *Uniformed services.* The Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, the Commissioned Corps of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and the Commissioned Corps of the Public Health Service.

(f) *Member of a uniformed service.* A person appointed, enlisted, inducted, called, ordered, or conscripted into a uniformed service who is serving on active duty or active duty for training.

(g) *Civilian veterinary service.* Treatment, surgery, or hospitalization by a civilian veterinarian. This term includes surgical appliances and medicine where indicated.

(h) *Civilian veterinarian.* Any person legally qualified and licensed without limitation to practice veterinary medicine where the veterinary service is performed.

§ 890.3 Policies.

(a) *When treatment is authorized.* Civilian medical and dental attendance for Air Force military personnel at public expense is authorized only when the required treatment cannot be obtained from available facilities of the Air Force or other Government agencies such as Army, Navy, Veterans' Administration, and U.S. Public Health Service.

(b) *Paying civilian agencies.* Vouchers for payment to civilian agencies will ordinarily be prepared by the director of base medical services of the Air Force installation nearest the civilian facility which provided the medical care and will be processed through the local accounting and finance officer for payment. Approving authority, see § 890.6, or certifying officers, will prepare vouchers at locations where there is no director of base medical services.

(c) *Itemized statement.* When charges appear excessive, an itemized statement will be obtained from the doctor or hospital before payment is made. The itemized statements should be submitted to the local medical society or referred to the next Air Force echelon of command for evaluation. This will avoid placing the Air Force medical facility commander in a position of controversy with doctors or hospitals.

§ 890.4 Care authorized from civilian sources.

Medical and dental care from civilian sources at Air Force expense is limited to that which would be provided by Air Force medical or dental facilities if they were available. Such care is authorized at Air Force expense as follows:

(a) When an Air Force member within the meaning of § 890.5 requires essential medical or dental care and there is neither an Air Force medical or dental

facility nor any other Government medical or dental facility available.

(b) When an Air Force medical or dental facility is unable to provide an essential medical or dental service for a uniformed service member due to a limitation of the facility or its staff.

(c) Civilian ambulance service at Air Force expense is authorized to move an Air Force member who is absent without leave or in desertion to a civilian medical facility or place of treatment or to a Government medical facility if the Air Force member is returned to military control or custody during or directly after such transportation or treatment.

§ 890.5 For whom authorized.

Medical and dental care from civilian sources in the absence of Air Force or other Government medical facilities is authorized at Air Force expense for the following Air Force personnel:

(a) Active duty military personnel of the Air Force, including Air Force Academy cadets and aviation cadets, on a duty status or in authorized absence, i.e., leave, pass, or authorized travel.

(b) Members of the Air Force Reserve who are injured or contract a disease in line of duty while on active duty or who are injured in line of duty while performing inactive-duty training or while voluntarily participating in an aerial flight in a Government-owned aircraft under proper authority and as an incident of training. Rehospitalization may be authorized under the provisions of this section for the same condition for which hospitalization at Air Force expense was initially required until no improvement will derive from further treatment.

(c) Members of the Air National Guard who are injured or become ill in line of duty when on active duty for the purpose of performing Air Force directed missions such as ferrying aircraft, runway alert, or such other duties as the Secretary of the Air Force may direct on competent Air Force orders. (Air National Guard members who are on active duty for training or inactive-duty training are also eligible for medical and dental care from civilian sources in accordance with ANG directives at Air National Guard expense. Such hospitalization may be authorized by the Air National Guard organization or Air Force base commander. This does not preclude admission and treatment of Air National Guard members at Air Force medical facilities.)

(d) Members of Air Force Reserve Officer Training Corps (AFROTC) who are injured or become ill in line of duty while en route to or from or while participating in summer encampments only. An AFROTC member is not entitled to medical service from civilian sources at Air Force expense beyond the training period specified in his training orders.

§ 890.6 Who authorizes.

Authority to approve civilian medical and dental attendance at Air Force expense is the responsibility:

(a) In emergencies, of the commander of the Air Force base or his authorized representative nearest the civilian medical facility providing the medical care.

Emergency medical service will not be delayed pending approval (see § 890.8).

(b) In other than emergencies, of the Air Force base commander or his authorized representative under whose jurisdiction the member requiring medical care is assigned, or the commander of the unit to which a member is assigned in cases where the member's organization is not at an Air Force base.

(c) For supplemental care, of the director of base medical services.

§ 890.7 When not authorized.

Civilian medical or dental care at Air Force expense is not authorized for:

(a) Persons other than those stated in § 890.5. (For dependents, see AFR 160-41 (Dependents' Medical Care) and AFR 160-29 (Civilian Medical Care for Eligible Dependents in Areas Other than CONUS, Alaska, Hawaii and Puerto Rico).)

(b) Elective treatment.

(c) Treatment when adequate medical or dental service is available from an Air Force or other Government medical or dental facility.

(d) Retired or discharged members of the Air Force. (An exception will be made for periodic examination, in whole or in part of Air Force members temporarily retired for disability (TDRL) when ordered by competent authority to civilian medical facilities for such examination.)

(e) Air Force military personnel absent without leave or in desertion.

NOTE: Charges incurred for civilian medical care when absent without authority are the sole responsibility of the individual concerned. Payment of charges for civilian medical care obtained after return of the individual to military control may be made from Air Force funds. Return to military control is effected when an absentee or deserter surrenders to, is delivered to, or is apprehended by an agent of the Armed Forces authorized to apprehend. (For ambulance service see § 890.4(c).)

(f) Air Force Reserve, Air National Guard, and AFROTC members other than those listed in § 890.5.

§ 890.8 Emergencies.

Emergency civilian medical or dental care at Air Force expense may be obtained without prior authority by or in behalf of Air Force members authorized in § 890.5. Emergency dental care is limited to relief of pain, treatment of acute septic conditions, or essential correction of dental injuries requiring immediate correction.

§ 890.9 Eye refractions obtained by individuals.

In the absence of an Air Force medical facility, and when eye refraction cannot be obtained from other Government agencies, refractive examinations necessary for the fitting of spectacles may be obtained from a civilian physician or licensed optometrist at Air Force expense by Air Force personnel on active duty only.

(a) Authority. Eye refraction under this section shall be approved by the authority in § 890.6 (a) or (b). Exception: Prior authority will not be required

for refractions for Air Force personnel on duty in foreign countries away from a uniformed service unit.

(b) Prescribing lenses. Civilian physicians or optometrists performing refractions for Air Force personnel will be requested to prescribe lenses to the closest $\frac{1}{4}$ diopter.

(c) Costs. The charge for refraction should be at local rates and should include the adjustment of frames and fitting of spectacles when delivered.

(d) Procuring spectacles. Procurement at Government expense of spectacles from civilian physicians or optometrists who perform refractions is not authorized. Spectacles are supplied and will be shipped to the Air Force member for whom prescribed.

§ 890.10 Surgical and orthopedic appliances.

Items authorized for base procurement may be provided by the civilian medical facility in connection with treatment and services otherwise authorized by §§ 890.1 to 890.14.

§ 890.11 Information required on statements and bills from civilian hospitals, physicians, dentists, and nurses.

(a) Hospital service. (1) Hospitalization charges at the daily or weekly rate will be shown with applicable dates.

(2) Charges for services not included in the daily or weekly rate including dates of such charges as, use of operating room, laboratory service, X-ray, medicine, ambulance service, etc., will be shown as follows:

(i) X-rays: Aggregate.

(ii) Routine laboratory tests: Aggregate.

(iii) Special laboratory tests by name.

(iv) Medicines: Aggregate.

(v) First aid or emergency treatment: State the exact nature of the services.

(vi) Ambulance service: Show the mileage involved and the flat rate or rate per mile, as the case may be. See § 890.3(c).

(vii) Long distance telephone call or telegram charges: Must be accompanied by certificate or copy of telegram.

(viii) Use of operating room: Indicate if this includes administration of anesthetic and if administered by a member of hospital staff. If not, show the charge separately in the name of the person administering the anesthetic. If the hospital has paid anesthetist, charge may be listed on hospital voucher, but must be accompanied by receipted bill from the anesthetist showing payment by hospital.

(ix) Items incident to treatment: List and itemize separately, crutches, special therapy, etc.

(x) Physician and nurses: Include only those regularly employed on a salary basis by the hospital and for whose services payments are due to the hospital. If this is the case, state that nurse or physician is a salaried member of hospital staff. If the hospital has paid physicians and nurses who are not salaried members of the staff, such charge may be included in the hospital bill but must be accompanied by a re-

ceipted bill showing payment by the hospital.

(b) Bills for physicians' or surgeons' services. (1) Visits: Show where visits were made, i.e., hospital, doctor's office, patient's home, etc. List date and charge for each visit chronologically. If two or more visits are made on any one day, enter the number for each day and mark them "first visit" and "second visit," etc. List date and charge for operations separately. List chronologically the date of each visit after the operation and itemize the charges and the services rendered.

(2) Other services (such as X-rays, laboratory services, and medicines): Aggregate.

(3) Medicines: Aggregate. If furnished from physician's own stock, certify on the voucher that they were furnished from his stock, charges, etc.

(c) Special nursing service. Indicate place where service was rendered, the hour it began and ended, the number of hours served each day or night, the rate per day or night, and the number of days or nights served.

NOTE: If a nurse went on duty at 11:00 p.m. on one day and went off duty at 7:00 a.m. the next day, only one night will be counted, although two dates are involved.

(d) Dental services. (1) Show each service rendered, such as extraction, filling, etc., and the charge for each. Identify each tooth involved. Show the number of tooth surfaces involved and filling material used.

(2) Filling operations, treatment of chronic lesions, prosthetic replacements, dental repair, and prolonged or extensive procedures, such as those required following the relief of immediate emergency, require prior approval of the authority cited in § 890.6.

§ 890.12 Veterinary care authorized.

Veterinary care is limited to that which would be available from an Air Force veterinarian if he were available. Civilian veterinary care for Government-owned animals assigned to Air Force units only is authorized at Air Force expense within the limitations of §§ 890.1 to 890.14.

§ 890.13 When to authorize civilian veterinary care.

Civilian veterinary care is authorized only in emergencies where the services of a military veterinarian are not economically available.

§ 890.14 Bills for veterinary service.

(a) List each service rendered, such as X-rays, laboratory service, hospitalization, medical treatment, splints, pins, etc., and the charge for each.

(b) Indicate on the vouchers if veterinary care was provided in an emergency.

For the Secretary of the Air Force.

CARROLL W. KELLEY,
Lieutenant Colonel, U.S. Air
Force, Chief, Special Activities
Group, Office of The
Judge Advocate General.

[F.R. Doc. 62-5448; Filed, June 5, 1962;
8:45 a.m.]

RULES AND REGULATIONS

Title 43—PUBLIC LANDS: INTERIOR

Chapter I—Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior

APPENDIX—PUBLIC LAND ORDERS

[Public Land Order 2689]

[1951769]

CALIFORNIA

Order Opening Public Lands

1. Public Land Order No. 948 of March 29, 1954, revoked Public Land Order No. 125 of May 20, 1943, so far as the latter order affected approximately 4,320 acres, and provided that the following described lands should not become subject to the initiation of any rights or to any disposition under the public land laws pending issuance of an order opening the lands to application under the Small Tract Act of June 1, 1938 (52 Stat. 609; 43 U.S.C. 682a), as amended:

SAN BERNARDINO

T. 6 N., R. 3 W.,
Sec. 21, NW¼.

Containing 160 acres.

2. The lands are hereby restored to the operation of the public land laws, including the mining laws, effective at 10:00 a.m. on July 6, 1962, subject to any valid existing rights, the requirements of applicable law, rules and regulations, and the provisions of existing withdrawals.

Inquiries concerning the lands shall be addressed to the Manager, Land Of-

fice, Bureau of Land Management, Riverside, California.

JOHN A. CARVER, Jr.,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

MAY 31, 1962.

[F.R. Doc. 62-5454; Filed, June 5, 1962;
8:46 a.m.]

Title 47—TELECOMMUNICATION

Chapter I—Federal Communications Commission

PART 2—FREQUENCY ALLOCATIONS AND RADIO TREATY MATTERS; GENERAL RULES AND REGULA- TIONS

Radio Equipment List

The Commission having under consideration § 2.541 of its rules, *Radio equipment list*; and

It appearing, that the Radio Equipment List is revised and published at irregular intervals as the need arises and that § 2.541 should be amended to more accurately reflect this fact; and

It further appearing, that the amendment adopted herein is editorial in nature, and hence that compliance with the public notice, procedural, and effective date requirements of section 4 of the Administrative Procedure Act is unnecessary; and

It further appearing, that authority for issuance of this amendment is contained in sections 4(i), 5(d), and 303(e) and 303(r) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, and section 0.341

(a) of the Commission's Statement of Organization, Delegations of Authority, and Other Information;

It is ordered, This 28th day of May 1962, that effective June 11, 1962, § 2.541 of the Commission's rules is amended as set forth below.

(Sec. 4, 48 Stat. 1066, as amended; 47 U.S.C. 154. Interprets or applies sec. 303, 48 Stat. 1082, as amended; 47 U.S.C. 303)

Released: June 1, 1962.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS

COMMISSION,

[SEAL]

BEN F. WAPLE,

Acting Secretary.

1. Section 2.541 is amended to read as follows:

§ 2.541 Radio equipment list.

A list of type approved and type accepted equipment is published periodically by the Commission. Public notice of type acceptance and type approval will be by publication in the equipment list, a copy of which will be furnished each manufacturer of listed equipment. Equipment which was listed prior to May 16, 1955, will be continued on the list unless it is removed by Commission action in accordance with the provisions of § 2.522. Copies of the Radio Equipment List are available for inspection at the Commission offices in Washington, D.C., and at each of its field offices. The Radio Equipment List is published in three parts:

Part A, Television Broadcast Equipment
Part B, Aural Broadcast Equipment
Part C, Other than Broadcast Equipment

[F.R. Doc. 62-5484; Filed, June 5, 1962;
8:51 a.m.]

Proposed Rule Making

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service

[7 CFR Parts 1001, 1006, 1007, 1014,
1015]

[Docket Nos. AO-14-A 33, AO-203-A 15, AO-
204-A 15, AO-302-A 7, and AO-305-A 6]

MILK IN GREATER BOSTON, SPRING- FIELD, AND WORCESTER, MASS.; SOUTHEASTERN NEW ENGLAND; AND CONNECTICUT MARKETING AREAS

Notice of Recommended Decision and Opportunity To File Written Excep- tions on Proposed Amendments to Tentative Marketing Agreements and to Orders

Pursuant to the provisions of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended (7 U.S.C. 601 et seq.), and the applicable rules of practice and procedure governing the formulation of marketing agreements and marketing orders (7 CFR Part 900), notice is hereby given of the filing with the Hearing Clerk of this recommended decision with respect to proposed amendments to the tentative marketing agreements and orders regulating the handling of milk in the Greater Boston, Massachusetts; Springfield, Massachusetts; Worcester, Massachusetts; Southeastern New England; and Connecticut marketing areas.

Interested parties may file written exceptions to this decision with the Hearing Clerk, United States Department of Agriculture, Washington 25, D.C., not later than the close of business the 7th day after publication of this decision in the FEDERAL REGISTER. Seven copies of such exceptions should be filed.

Preliminary statement. The hearing on the record of which the proposed amendments, as hereinafter set forth, to the tentative marketing agreements and to the orders, were formulated, was conducted at Boston, Massachusetts, on April 2-4, 1962, pursuant to notice thereof which was issued March 21, 1962 (27 F.R. 2802).

The material issues on the record of the hearing relate to:

1. Extension of city plant pricing area;
2. Qualifications for determining pool plant status under each of the New England orders;
3. Revision of the nearby farm location differential provisions of each New England order;
4. Revision of the diversion provisions of the Southern New England order; and
5. Miscellaneous, administrative and conforming changes affecting the several orders.

Findings and conclusions. The following findings and conclusions on the material issues are based on evidence

presented at the hearing and the record thereof:

1. **Definition of "city plant".** The Greater Boston order should be amended to provide that the "city plant" price differentials be applied to all pool plants within 80 miles of Boston.

Under the present provisions of the order all plants located within 40 miles of the State House in Boston are subject to zone price differentials over the 21st zone of 54 cents on Class I milk and on milk received from producers and of 5.8 cents on Class II milk. The 54-cent differential allows for the cost of moving milk from country plants to the marketing area and other factors, including a handling allowance to compensate for the additional costs of first receiving milk at country plants and then transporting it to city distributing plants. The 5.8 cent differential on Class II milk compensates for the cost of moving cream and nonfat dry milk, which are among the principal products made from Class II milk. These differentials are based solely on plant location and do not take into consideration whether a plant is a distributing plant or a supply plant.

Historically, with few exceptions, distributing plants have been located within a short distance of the major retail outlets served. Supply plants, on the other hand, are located in the major production areas of Vermont, New Hampshire, and Maine. Until recently the present definition of "city plant" has not caused problems as between distributing plants and supply plants.

Because of recent technological changes within the industry, distributing plant operators have expanded considerably the areas in which they distribute milk on routes. As distribution areas have expanded, distributing plants may become regulated by virtue of route sales within the marketing area even though the plants are located outside the 40-mile boundary that now distinguishes "city plants" from "country plants".

Under the present terms of the Boston order, a distributing plant located just beyond the 40-mile boundary would account for Class I milk at 17 cents per hundredweight less than plants located within the 40-mile boundary. In December 1961, a plant located in the Worcester marketing area and previously regulated under the Worcester order became regulated for one month under the Greater Boston order because its route sales within the Boston marketing area were greater than its route sales in the Worcester marketing area. The price at which the handler accounted for his Class I milk under the Boston order was 17 cents less than that applicable under the Worcester order, because the plant was so situated as to be a city plant under the Worcester order but a country plant, in the 41-60 mile zone, under the Boston order.

Another effect of the plant's shift from city plant status to country plant status was that for the month involved the minimum blended price payable to the producers was a country plant price, rather than a city plant price as was the case under the Worcester order. This country plant blended price was 17 cents less than the city plant blended price under the Boston order.

This change merely restores the previous price levels payable at this plant and will have no effect on the long-run total income from Class I sales for the two markets.

The proposed amended definition of "city plant" will cause it to encompass all distributing plants now serving the Greater Boston market with the exception of a plant located at Bellows Falls, Vermont. Although this plant qualifies for pooling as a distributing plant on the basis of its route distribution in the marketing area, it also meets the order requirements for pooling as a supply plant. To require this plant to account for Class I milk on the same basis as distributing plants that are located in close proximity to city markets, would place it at a competitive disadvantage in relation to supply plants in the same general area in which it procures milk from producers.

2. **Qualifications for pool plant status—**
(a) **Distributing plants.** The requirement under which a plant must dispose of at least 50 percent of its total receipts of fluid milk products as Class I milk to qualify as a "distributing plant" under the five New England orders should not be changed. However, a distributing plant which otherwise qualifies as a pool plant but which fails to meet such minimum percentage requirements should not be disqualified as a pool plant until the third consecutive month in which it has so failed to meet such requirements.

A proposal to reduce the Class I utilization requirements for distributing plants was offered by a cooperative association representing producers in all 5 New England markets. This producer association was concerned that in the present surplus situation, certain distributing plants might not meet the total Class I requirement and consequently would lose their pool status. The proposal presented would reduce the total Class I requirement from 50 to 25 percent in all months or, in the alternative, to the same level as the respective shipping percentage applicable to supply plants in such market.

In support of its proposal, the cooperative stated that the present utilization requirement has worked a hardship on distributing plants, and especially on those handlers receiving milk from local producers only. It was pointed out that such handlers are not able to adjust receipts to Class I needs as readily as are multiple plant operators receiving milk from supply plants. Plants receiving milk from local producers must either receive all the milk of their normal com-

plement of producers or seek a temporary outlet through diversion or assignment of certain producers to other plants. When all the milk normally received by such handlers is not needed, it is generally the proponent cooperative which assumes the responsibility of providing a market for such milk.

It is recognized that the present requirements may at times place a burden on certain distributing plants and also on cooperative associations which have assumed supply balancing functions for the several markets. However, the important consideration in establishing standards for association with the marketwide pool is to distinguish between plants primarily engaged in Class I operations and properly part of the Class I market and those primarily engaged in manufacturing operations.

The present 50 percent Class I utilization requirements for distributing plants were included in Connecticut and South-eastern New England orders at their inception and were incorporated in the other New England orders on September 1, 1960. There has been only one instance of a plant losing pool status for failure to meet the stated Class I utilization requirements. This plant failed to qualify by a very small margin. Although evidence was presented with regard to problems encountered in allocating milk supplies in a manner to insure pool status of some plants, the remedy proposed is extreme for the circumstances found.

There are serious consequences involved to a handler and to his producers when a plant loses its pool status.

Allowing a plant which fails to meet the 50 percent requirement to have pool status, as otherwise provided, for a period sufficiently long to give the plant operator time to adjust his operations in a manner which will insure continued pool status will alleviate the problems cited. This may be accomplished by providing that a distributing plant which fails to meet the Class I utilization requirements may have such pool status for two consecutive months before being excluded from pooling for failure to meet the specified requirements.

(b) *System pooling.* The pooling requirements for supply plants under the Greater Boston order should be modified to provide more flexibility for plants pooling on a "system" basis.

The Boston order now permits system pooling during the months of August through November for two or more supply plants operated by the same handler if the total shipments to regulated distributing plants in each month of the July-November period are at least 15 percent of the combined dairy farmer receipts in the month and if each plant in the system ships at least 15 percent of its dairy farmer receipts in the month of July.

A proposal presented would modify the system pooling provisions of the Boston order so that the system pooling could apply in July also, with each plant in a pooled system having the choice of shipping 15 percent in any one of the months of July through November. Under the proposal the system as a whole

would continue to be required to ship 15 percent in each of the months of July through November.

The provision that each plant in a system ship 15 percent in the first month of the qualifying period is intended to demonstrate such plant's ability and right to association with the pool. Demonstration of the ability to ship from a particular plant is a reasonable requirement for its participation in the pool and should be continued. However, requiring each plant in a system to meet the specified shipping percentage in the month of July tends to nullify in that month the objectives of the system pooling provisions.

In multiple plant operations it is normally more economical to ship milk from certain supply plants closest to the market while more distant milk is held up country for manufacturing purposes. Requiring all plants in a system to ship 15 percent in the same month may result in uneconomic "back hauling" of milk and increased hauling charges for milk received from more distant plants.

The objectives of orderly marketing of supply plant milk will be maintained and the marketwide pool adequately protected if each supply plant in a system is allowed to make its qualifying shipment in any one of the months of July through November. The system in its entirety, however, should be required to ship 15 percent of the total dairy farmer receipts in each of these months. As is presently provided, a plant entering the system for the first time should establish its association with the pool by making a qualifying shipment apart from the remainder of the system in the first month in which it becomes associated with the market.

In opposition it was stated that the adoption of this proposal would make it easier for handlers to qualify plants. However, since each plant will continue to be required to make individual shipments in at least one month and since a system must continue, as before, to ship not less than 15 percent of its total dairy farmer receipts in each month of the qualifying period, the pooling standards will not be significantly changed.

(c) *Pooling cooperatives supply plants under the Connecticut order.* The Connecticut order pool plant provisions should be amended to facilitate the pooling of producer-operated supply plants that serve a supply-balancing function for the market.

A proposal to provide automatic pool status for a plant operated by a cooperative association was supported by two major cooperative associations in the market. Representatives of both cooperatives testified that such a provision should apply to plants that serve an essential supply-balancing function for the market. It was suggested by one of the cooperatives that an appropriate method might be to designate a cooperatively-owned plant as a pool plant if a large percentage of the member dairy farmers delivering to such plant are in the Connecticut order nearby farm location differential area.

Each of the two cooperatives supporting the proposal operates plants now

pooled as supply plants under the Connecticut order. Although their operations differ in some respects, both cooperatives perform important supply-balancing functions for Connecticut proprietary handlers and insure markets for member producers.

One of the cooperative plants, located at Great Barrington, Massachusetts, regularly receives the milk of certain producers for sale in various markets. Milk is assembled at Great Barrington for regular delivery to Connecticut order distributing plants in the quantities needed to fulfill day-to-day fluid requirements of its buying handlers. On days when distributing plants supplied by this plant are not operating, milk is shipped from Great Barrington for disposition in outside markets.

In addition to supplying handlers directly from its Great Barrington plant, the cooperative also supplies milk to Connecticut distributing plants in bulk tank trucks. Frequently, when this milk is not needed by the handler, it is moved to the Great Barrington plant as producer milk and there assembled for outside disposition. In this manner the cooperative not only serves as a supply plant for certain distributing plants but also assists such plants by marketing milk of its members which is normally delivered to such plants directly from farms.

The other cooperative operates a supply plant at Hartford, Connecticut, at which milk is received from member producers. In addition, member milk is moved directly from farms to some 65 buying handlers' distributing plants. A portion of the milk received at the cooperative's supply plant is moved regularly to distributing plants and some is used as supplemental supplies for buying handlers who normally receive milk directly from cooperative members' farms. On weekends and on other days when distributing plants are not operating, the milk normally received at buying handlers' plants is received as producer milk at the Hartford plant. Most buying handlers receive only the amount of milk needed to fulfill their fluid needs. When necessary the cooperative obtains outside milk to fulfill handlers' requirements.

The plants for which automatic pooling was requested perform an essential and necessary service to the market in supplying handlers' needs and in providing a market for milk in excess of fluid requirements. The amount of milk supplied to distributing plants by proponent cooperatives would be more than ample to qualify such plants if received there and then moved on to the proprietary handler, but with the wide use of bulk tank delivery it is more economical in most cases to cause such milk to be delivered directly from the farm to distributing plants. When moved by the latter method the milk, of course, is not available as a qualifying shipment from the cooperative's plant.

Each cooperative's plant is so located that member milk could be first received there and then transported to buying handlers' distributing plants. This would facilitate the qualification of such

plants but could force producer associations to make uneconomical movements of milk for the sole purpose of assuring pool status for their plants.

The proponent cooperatives supply a large percentage of their members' milk deliveries to distributing plants, either directly or through the supply plants for which automatic pooling is requested. This service provided by proponent cooperatives may be appropriately recognized in the pooling of such supply plants.

The order should allow a cooperative association to pool automatically one supply plant if the total deliveries of milk of member producers to Connecticut distributing plants, either directly or through its supply plants, are equal to at least 50 percent of the total receipts of producer milk marketed by such cooperative. Such a provision will make it possible for a cooperative to direct producer milk from the farms to distributing plants when this method is more economical than receiving such milk at its plant. The amendment would base such qualification of a cooperative's supply plant on the aggregate, and continuing, delivery performance and service to the market and would be available on the above basis to any cooperative association performing a similar service.

Although one of the proponent cooperatives presently has two supply plants pooled under the order, it was stated by a representative of such association that the provision should be limited to their plant closest to the marketing area, which plant is presently performing the services described. Limiting the proposed provision to a cooperative's plant closest to the marketing area is reasonable in view of the underlying considerations.

The suggestion that a cooperative's supply plant be designated as a pool plant if the members delivering to such plant are located in a certain designated area would not base the plant's qualification on performance of a service to the market and should not be adopted for that reason.

If a cooperative elects to have a plant which qualifies partially on the basis of direct-shipped milk included as a part of a plant system, the shipment requirements for system pooling should be the determining factor for qualifying such plant within the unit.

(d) *Other pool plant proposals.* Other proposals to change the performance standards for supply plants to pool under the various orders should not be adopted.

There were two proposals to alter the New England order shipping percentages for supply plants. One proposal would lower the Connecticut, Southeastern New England, Springfield and Worcester shipping percentages to 15 percent, the level now contained in the Boston order. The other proposal would raise the Boston order shipping requirement to 30 percent, the level presently contained in the other four New England orders. Another proposal to amend only the Southeastern New England pooling provisions would require the pooling provisions of

such order to be met before a country plant could be pooled under the order, notwithstanding that the plant was pooled in the qualifying months under another order.

For the most part the proposals to alter the shipping percentages and related proposals were intended to facilitate movements of milk among the markets and thereby promote better intermarket price alignment.

The evidence presented in support of the proposal to reduce pooling requirements for supply plants was concerned primarily with marketing under the Southeastern New England order, although proponent indicated the desirability of modifying corresponding provisions in the other orders to correlate them with any amendments adopted in the Southeastern New England order. However, no specific problems were presented with respect to the other New England orders. As was suggested by certain witnesses, the pooling problems described at this hearing are intricately involved with the considerations also inherent in the proper delineation of marketing areas.

The record of this hearing is not sufficiently comprehensive to determine the overall impact of the various proposals on marketing under the New England orders. Although some immediate problems might be alleviated temporarily by changing the pooling requirements under the Southeastern New England order, problems of pooling under other New England orders might also be raised by such action.

It is concluded that action to amend the supply plant pooling requirements on the basis of this record be deferred pending another hearing review, at which time alternative solutions also may be explored, including proposals to consider consolidating two or more of the New England orders.

3. *Nearby farm location differentials.* The town of Brookline, Vermont, should be included in the 23-cent per hundred-weight nearby farm differential area of the Springfield order. No other change should be made in the nearby farm location differential provisions of the five New England Federal orders.

A producer in the Springfield market whose farm is located in the southern half of the town of Brookline, Vermont, proposed that the southern portion of such town be added to the present 23-cent nearby farm differential area of the Springfield order. Recent legal action over disputed town boundary lines has resulted in a change in the boundary between the town of Brookline and the adjoining town of Putney from that which existed at the time the present 23-cent nearby farm differential area was established. As a result of this action, the southern boundary of the town of Brookline was moved southward to adjoin the Vermont town of Dummerston. This places the major portion of the town of Brookline south of the northern limit of the current 23-cent nearby farm differential area in the adjoining towns of Putney and Newfane. Also, the enlarged town of Brookline now encompasses a previous portion of the town

of Putney which currently is in the 23-cent differential area. The proponent contends that this major portion of the town of Brookline logically should be included in that differential area.

In conformity with the practice under the Springfield order of defining nearby farm differential areas by town boundaries, the Springfield order should be amended to include the town of Brookline in its entirety within the 23-cent nearby farm differential area under that order. This will provide more equitable pricing to any Springfield producer with a farm located in the town of Brookline as compared with neighboring Springfield producers and will insure continuance of the differential payment to any Springfield producer formerly in the town of Putney who similarly may have been affected by the shift of boundaries.

3a. *Common nearby farm differential area.* Three cooperative associations proposed that the nearby farm differential provisions of all the New England orders be amended to provide that any producer whose farm is located in New England and who now receives a nearby farm differential (either 46 cents or 23 cents, as the case may be) shall be paid a similar differential irrespective of the New England order under which his milk is pooled. The proponents contended that changes in recent years in the marketing of milk in the five markets necessitate further coordination of the nearby farm differentials of these orders.

Conversion to bulk tank delivery of milk from farm to market, closing and consolidation of distributing plants with remaining plants serving more than one market, shifting of plants between markets on a month-to-month basis, and recent expansion of Federal order regulation to the Southeastern New England and Connecticut markets in recent years were given as factors causing some producers to become disassociated with their customary market. The shifting of producers to other markets has resulted, in some cases, in a reduction in returns to such producers because of a change in the nearby farm differential to which they are entitled. When producers must be transferred to another market, the cooperative association shifting the milk considers it imperative to find a new market which will entitle the producers involved to the same nearby farm differential which they had received previously. Lack of uniformity in the nearby farm differential zones of the five orders was described as an impediment to the maintenance of customary returns to producers. Proponents indicated that common nearby farm differential areas for all five orders would contribute to the natural and orderly movement of producer milk to the several New England markets, and would allow the shifting of individual producers between markets without undue loss in their returns.

These orders presently provide that there be deducted from the respective pools sufficient funds to return to producers located in specified areas relatively near to the respective marketing areas either 46 cents or 23 cents per hundredweight in excess of the applicable blended price, depending upon lo-

cation. These provisions were established in recognition of the customary pattern of prices that existed in these markets prior to Federal order regulation. Such prices reflected the higher returns received by nearby producers because of their proximity to the principal consumption areas as compared with lower returns received by producers more distant from such areas. As pointed out in the record, the problems described by the proponents at this hearing do not warrant such a change in the nearby farm differential provisions at the present time. The plan suggested by proponents would result in a pricing structure for producers under the five orders considerably different from the historical price patterns on which the present provisions were based. In many cases producers who customarily have received a 23-cent nearby farm differential or none at all might become eligible to receive a higher differential in markets with which they have not had an historical association. As long as pricing is maintained by individual market areas, the function of the nearby farm differential properly is related to the orientation of supplies for the several markets individually.

The several individual cases of producer shifts between markets, which were cited by the proponents to illustrate the need for more uniform nearby farm differentials among the five markets, indicate that at least some of the problems encountered by the proponents have not been of a continuing nature. In certain instances the cooperative associations involved were able to shift their producer members to other markets without loss in returns, and in at least one instance specific amendment action was taken by the Department to alleviate the problem.

As suggested in the record, factors such as the rapid conversion to bulk tank delivery of milk and the closing and consolidation of distributing plants indicate the pertinency of review of the present structure of nearby farm differential areas in relation to any proposed changes in the scope of the regulation. The record of this hearing, however, does not contain evidence that is sufficiently exploratory or comprehensive in nature to support a substantial deviation from the present design of the nearby farm differential provisions.

On the basis of the record of this hearing, it is therefore concluded that no changes, other than as described for the Springfield order, should be made in the nearby farm location differential provisions of the New England orders.

4. *Diversion provisions.* The producer definition of the Southeastern New England order should be amended to provide for more flexible diversion privileges than it now provides.

The definition of producer sets forth the requirements which a dairy farmer must meet if he is to qualify as a producer under the order. Stipulated in these requirements are certain limitations regarding any diversion of his milk from the pool plant where it is customarily received to an unregulated plant. Should a dairy farmer's milk be diverted in excess of the prescribed limits, such

person would become ineligible as a producer for the entire month in which the "over-diversion" occurred. The present provisions allow diversions without limitation during any of the months of April through June. During July, August, or September, however, the milk of a producer may not be diverted on more than 8 days per month (4 days in the case of every-other-day delivery). During each of the remaining months of October through March, diversions are limited to 12 days per month (6 days in the case of every-other-day delivery).

A proprietary handler proposed that the diversion provisions under the Southeastern New England order be made identical to those of the Greater Boston order. A witness representing a cooperative association which has members delivering milk to the proponent's plant gave testimony in support of this proposal. Each stressed that the present diversion provisions are too stringent and work a hardship on handlers and cooperative associations in keeping dairy farmers qualified as producers. They contended that handlers should be permitted to match their diversion schedules against their supply-demand patterns. Such factors as a substantial oversupply of milk in certain months, the loss of major outlets such as military installations, and unusual circumstances causing disruptions in plant operations create the need for greater flexibility in the diversion provisions for producer milk. They indicated that diversion provisions similar to those in the Greater Boston, Springfield, and Worcester orders would provide such flexibility without need to increase the total number of days on which the milk of a producer could be diverted.

The diversion limitations now prescribed for milk diverted from a pool plant to an unregulated plant should be modified to permit diversion of a producer's milk on any day: Provided that his milk is not diverted on more days during the 12 months ending with the current month than the number of days in the 12-month period it is delivered to a pool plant. Under this arrangement diversion would not be tied to monthly limits. Instead, the allowable number of days on which producer milk might be diverted could accumulate over a period of several months. Such a modification would not result in an increase in the total number of allowable days of diversion. In fact, on an annual basis five fewer days of diversion would be allowed. The modification would provide, however, an element of flexibility in the diversion of milk to an extent heretofore not possible under the terms of the Southeastern New England order.

The diversion provisions proposed herein would afford a handler the opportunity of adjusting more efficiently his milk supply to his fluid milk requirements. Any unusual marketing conditions or unexpected interruptions in plant operations would tend to have a less disruptive effect on the daily coordination of a handler's supply with his sales. From time to time handlers find it necessary, for the purpose of keeping dairy farmers qualified as producers, to

move milk which is surplus to their operation from farms to their distributing plants, unload and reload the milk at that point, and move the milk to manufacturing plants located nearer such farms than the distributing plants. Also, the handler occasionally finds it to his advantage to release producers rather than to over-divert their milk, inasmuch as over-diversion results in the receipt of other source milk, with possible adverse effects on cost to the handler. More flexible diversion privileges would promote more orderly marketing of milk.

A corollary provision should be included to accommodate the producer whose milk may be over-diverted by virtue of being moved from the farm in a tank truck, and therein commingled with milk of other producers which is diverted within the limits proposed herein. Such producer's milk would not be considered as being over-diverted if the diversion of milk from a majority of the other producers on the truck is held within the prescribed limits.

5. *Miscellaneous, administrative and conforming changes—(a) New England Class I price formula.* One of the factors used in the New England Class I price formulas is the United States Wholesale Commodity Price Index. This index is compiled and issued by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, U.S. Department of Labor.

Until March 1962 this index had been reported with 1947-49 as the base years. Beginning with March 1962 the Bureau updated its formula and began reporting this index with the years 1957-59 as the base period.

The Class I price formula contains a conversion factor (1.19) which has been used to convert the monthly index to a 1958 equivalent, the base year used for computing all Class I pricing factors.

Because of the time lag in the use of the price index, the months of November 1957 through October 1958 would have been used to compute the Class I prices for the months in 1958. The average of the monthly indexes for this period, on a 1957-59 base, is 100.25.

Accordingly, the factor 1.0025 should replace the factor 1.19 for the purpose of converting the monthly wholesale commodity price indexes to a 1958 equivalent. This amendment does not change the New England basic Class I price but is necessary to accommodate the Department of Labor's revised method of reporting the index.

Another factor used in the Class I pricing formula is the per capita disposable income in the United States as computed by the U.S. Department of Commerce. Until recently this income series carried a reference "continental United States". The reference to the word "continental" is no longer employed by the Department of Commerce and the New England orders should be amended accordingly.

(b) *Classification of transfers and diversions.* The Connecticut order should be amended to provide that during the months of July through November milk transferred or diverted in bulk, or transferred as a packaged fluid milk product

containing at least 3 percent butterfat, to pool plants under the New York-New Jersey Federal order shall be classified as Class I milk to the extent of that amount of such milk assigned to Class I-A under the New York-New Jersey order and not subject to compensatory payments under such order.

The Connecticut order presently provides that milk moved from a plant regulated under that order to a New York-New Jersey plant shall be classified as Class II milk, regardless of its ultimate use or assignment under the New York-New Jersey order. One exception is made, however, in that a Class I classification is given to any milk so moved which is classified as Class I-B milk under the New York-New Jersey order. In his decision issued February 11, 1959 (24 F.R. 1049) with respect to the promulgation of the Connecticut order, the Secretary stated that such a provision was established in recognition of those instances when Connecticut handlers might find it more convenient and economical to move surplus milk to nearby New York-New Jersey distributing plants rather than to more distant manufacturing plants.

Such a movement of milk could occur even though the New York-New Jersey plants customarily obtain their milk supplies from the New York-New Jersey milkshed and such milkshed has ample supplies for all the fluid milk needs of that market. The Secretary further stated that the Connecticut milk so moved should be considered as surplus to the needs of the Connecticut market. The classification provisions of the two orders were coordinated in this manner to provide for the appropriate classification of milk moved from Connecticut plants to New York-New Jersey plants in accordance with these findings.

Unusual marketing conditions, however, such as those resulting from the strike of employees at New York City milk plants in October and November 1961 which led to the shipment to New York City of considerable quantities of bottled milk from Connecticut regulated plants, may cause producer milk under the Connecticut order to be priced in certain months of the year in a manner which does not return to the producers the full use value of the milk.

In the specific case referred to, New York-New Jersey supply plants moved bulk milk to Connecticut plants for processing and packaging, and these plants in turn moved packaged fluid milk products to New York-New Jersey plants from which the milk was disposed of on routes in the New York-New Jersey marketing area. Because the amount of milk moved from Connecticut plants to New York-New Jersey plants for distribution was at least equal to the amount moved to the Connecticut plants from the New York-New Jersey supply plants, the New York-New Jersey order milk so moved was required to be classified as Class I-A milk under that order. No compensatory charges under the New York-New Jersey order were applicable on the milk received from the Connecticut plants since an equivalent amount of

Class I-A milk had been moved to Connecticut plants.

The Connecticut order provides that during the months of July through November the lesser of (a) 15 percent of producer receipts, or (b) the amount of Class II utilization remaining after the assignment of receipts of other source milk from non-Federal order sources, be set aside prior to the assignment of receipts of milk from other Federal order markets.

In the cases cited, this procedure resulted in the assignment of milk received from New York-New Jersey plants to the Class I utilization of the Connecticut plants in these months. Consequently, an equal amount of Connecticut producer milk had to be assigned to Class II utilization at those plants.

The set-aside provision in the Connecticut order was established in recognition that the months of July through November were the months of greatest demand for fluid milk in the market in relation to regular supplies and, hence, the months in which supplemental supplies most likely would be needed by Connecticut plants. The New York-New Jersey milk moved to Connecticut plants was moved back to New York-New Jersey plants in packaged form for disposition in the New York-New Jersey marketing area and was not used to supplement the Connecticut market under conditions of inadequate supplies. The Connecticut producer milk, on the other hand, which was classified as Class II milk because of its sale into a New York-New Jersey order pool plant, was in fact used for Class I purposes in the Connecticut market. Thus, the returns to the Connecticut producers did not reflect the actual utilization of the milk in the market for which it was produced.

To achieve equitable pricing of the milk of Connecticut producers under unusual marketing conditions such as herein described, it is concluded that the classification provisions of the Connecticut order should be amended as provided herein.

Rulings on proposed findings and conclusions. Briefs and proposed findings and conclusions were filed on behalf of certain interested parties. These briefs, proposed findings and conclusions and the evidence in the record were considered in making the findings and conclusions set forth above. To the extent that the suggested findings and conclusions filed by interested parties are inconsistent with the findings and conclusions set forth herein, the requests to make such findings or reach such conclusions are denied for the reasons previously stated in this decision.

General findings. The findings and determinations hereinafter set forth are supplementary and in addition to the findings and determinations previously made in connection with the issuance of the aforesaid orders and of the previously issued amendments thereto; and all of said previous findings and determinations are hereby ratified and affirmed, except insofar as such findings and determinations may be in conflict with the findings and determinations set forth herein.

(a) The tentative marketing agreements and the orders, as hereby proposed to be amended, and all of the terms and conditions thereof, will tend to effectuate the declared policy of the Act;

(b) The parity prices of milk as determined pursuant to section 2 of the Act are not reasonable in view of the price of feeds, available supplies of feeds, and other economic conditions which affect market supply and demand for milk in the marketing areas, and the minimum prices specified in the proposed marketing agreements and the orders, as hereby proposed to be amended, are such prices as will reflect the aforesaid factors, insure a sufficient quantity of pure and wholesome milk, and be in the public interest; and

(c) The tentative marketing agreements and the orders, as hereby proposed to be amended, will regulate the handling of milk in the same manner as, and will be applicable only to persons in the respective classes of industrial and commercial activity specified in, the marketing agreements upon which a hearing has been held.

Recommended marketing agreements and orders amending the orders. The following orders amending the orders regulating the handling of milk in the Greater Boston, Mass.; Springfield, Mass.; Worcester, Mass.; Southeastern New England and Connecticut marketing areas are recommended as the detailed and appropriate means by which the foregoing conclusions may be carried out. The recommended marketing agreements are not included in this decision because the regulatory provisions thereof would be the same as those contained in the orders, as hereby proposed to be amended:

Amendments to Greater Boston order provisions. 1. In § 1001.3, the number "40" in paragraphs (b) and (c) is changed to "80" and paragraph (f) is revised as follows:

§ 1001.3 Definitions of plants.

* * * * *

(f) "Distributing plant" means any processing and packaging plant: (1) With route disposition in the marketing area in the month of not less than 10 percent of its receipts from dairy farmers or of its total receipts of fluid milk products; and (2) with total Class I disposition in the month or in either of the two preceding months of at least 50 percent of its total receipts of fluid milk products in the corresponding month.

2. In § 1001.20(d), the word "August" in the language preceding subparagraph (1) is changed to "July" and a new subparagraph (3) is added as follows:

§ 1001.20 Basic pooling requirements.

* * * *

(d) * * *

(3) No plant shall be eligible for pool plant status under this paragraph in November of any year unless it has met the requirements of paragraph (c) of this section in one of the months of July through October of that year.

§ 1001.42 [Amendment]

3. In § 1001.42(c), the phrase "Within 40" in Column A of the table is changed to "Within 80" and the second, third and fourth lines in Columns A, B, C and D of the table are revoked.

4. In § 1001.48(a) the word "continental" in subparagraph (2) is changed to "the" and subparagraph (1) is revised as follows:

§ 1001.48 Computation of New England basic Class I price.

(a) * * *

(1) Divide by 1.0025 the monthly wholesale price index for all commodities as reported by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, United States Department of Labor, with the years 1957-59 as the base period.

Amendments to Springfield order provisions. 1. In § 1006.3, paragraph (f) is revised as follows:

§ 1006.3 Definitions of plants.

(f) "Distributing plant" means any processing and packaging plant: (1) With route disposition in the marketing area in the month of not less than 10 percent of its receipts from dairy farmers or of its total receipts of fluid milk products; and (2) with total Class I disposition in the month or in either of the two preceding months of at least 50 percent of its total receipts of fluid milk products in the corresponding month.

2. In § 1006.48(a), the word "continental" in subparagraph (2) is changed to "the" and subparagraph (1) is revised as follows:

§ 1006.48 Computation of New England basic Class I price.

(a) * * *

(1) Divide by 1.0025 the monthly wholesale price index for all commodities as reported by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, United States Department of Labor, with the years 1957-59 as the base period.

§ 1006.64 [Amendment]

3. In § 1006.64(a), add the town of "Brookline" to the list of Vermont towns. *Amendments to Worcester order provisions.* 1. In § 1007.3, paragraph (f) is revised as follows:

§ 1007.3 Definitions of plants.

(f) "Distributing plant" means any processing and packaging plant: (1) With route disposition in the marketing area in the month of not less than 10 percent of its receipts from dairy farmers or of its total receipts of fluid milk products; and (2) with total Class I disposition in the month or in either of the two preceding months of at least 50 percent of its total receipts of fluid milk products in the corresponding month.

2. In § 1007.48(a) the word "continental" in subparagraph (2) is changed to "the" and subparagraph (1) is revised as follows:

§ 1007.48 Computation of New England basic Class I price.

(a) * * *

(1) Divide by 1.0025 the monthly wholesale price index for all commodities as reported by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, United States Department of Labor, with the years 1957-59 as the base period.

Amendments to Southeastern New England order provisions. 1. In § 1014.2, paragraph (e) is revised as follows:

§ 1014.2 Definitions of persons.

(e) "Producer" means any dairy farmer (except a dairy farmer for other markets, a dairy farmer with respect to exempt milk delivered, any person holding producer-handler status under any Federal order, or a dairy farmer who is a producer under another Federal order with respect to milk diverted from a plant subject to such other order) whose milk is delivered from his farm to a pool plant or is diverted from a pool plant to a plant specified in subparagraphs (1) through (3) of this paragraph if the handler, in filing his monthly report pursuant to § 1014.30, reports the milk as receipts from a producer at such pool plant: *Provided*, That any dairy farmer whose milk is diverted on more than the number of days specified shall not be considered to qualify under this paragraph with respect to any of his deliveries of milk during such month:

(1) A regulated plant of another handler;

(2) A regulated plant of the same handler in the same plant zone; or

(3) An unregulated plant under the following conditions:

(i) Milk moved from such farm is not diverted to an unregulated plant from such pool plant on more days during the 12 months ending with the current month than it is delivered to such pool plant; or

(ii) Milk moved from such farm is moved in a tank truck in which it is commingled with milk from other farms, the milk from a majority of which farms is diverted from such pool plant during the month in accordance with subdivision (i) of this subparagraph.

2. In § 1014.3 paragraphs (c) (1) and (d) are revised as follows:

§ 1014.3 Definitions of plants.

(c) * * *

(1) Any receiving plant (except the plant of a producer-handler under any Federal order) with route disposition in the marketing area in the month of not less than 10 percent of its receipts from dairy farmers and with total Class I disposition in the month or in either of the two preceding months of at least 50 percent of its total receipts of fluid milk products in the corresponding month, unless the market administrator determines that such plant disposed of a greater proportion of its Class I milk in another Federal order marketing area

on routes than was so disposed of in this marketing area.

(d) "Regulated plant" means (1) any pool plant, or (2) any other plant (except the plant of a producer-handler under any Federal order) with route disposition in the marketing area in the month of not less than 10 percent of its total receipts of fluid milk products and with total Class I disposition in the month or in either of the two preceding months of at least 50 percent of its total receipts of fluid milk products in the corresponding month, unless the market administrator determines that such plant disposed of a greater proportion of its Class I milk in another marketing area on routes.

3. In § 1014.41(a), the word "continental" in subparagraph (2) is changed to "the" and subparagraph (1) is revised as follows:

§ 1014.41 Computation of New England basic Class I price.

(a) * * *

(1) Divide by 1.0025 the monthly wholesale price index for all commodities as reported by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, United States Department of Labor, with the years 1957-59 as the base period.

Amendments to Connecticut order provisions. 1. In § 1015.3, a colon is placed after the word "means" which immediately precedes paragraph (c) (1), the reference "subdivision (i) through (v)" in the introductory text of paragraph (c) (2) is changed to "subdivisions (i) through (vi)", paragraph (c) (1) is revised, a new paragraph (c) (2) (vi) is added and paragraph (d) is revised as follows:

§ 1015.3 Definitions of plants.

(c) * * *

(1) Any receiving plant (except the plant of a producer-handler under any Federal order) with route disposition in the marketing area in the month of not less than 10 percent of its receipts from dairy farmers and with total Class I disposition in the month or in either of the two preceding months of at least 50 percent of its total receipts of fluid milk products in the corresponding month, unless the market administrator determines that such plant disposed of a greater proportion of its Class I milk in another Federal order marketing area on routes than was so disposed of in this marketing area.

(2) * * *

(vi) That receiving plant operated by an association of producers (which shall be the plant closest to Hartford, Connecticut, if more than one is operated by such association) shall be a pool plant in any month in which the total quantity of milk shipped therefrom to a pool plant qualified pursuant to subparagraph (1) of this paragraph, to a producer-handler or to a regulated plant other than a pool plant, plus the total quantity of milk received directly from farms at pool plants qualified pursuant to subparagraph (1)

of this paragraph from producers who are members of such association, is at least 50 percent of the aggregate deliveries during such month of dairy farmer-member milk to all pool plants and to the receiving plant for which pooling qualification pursuant to this subdivision is requested on or before the 15th day of such month: *Provided*, That a receiving plant which has pooling status under this subdivision shall continue in such status unless the operating association submits, on or before the 15th day of the month to which nonpool status is to apply, a written request to the market administrator to withdraw such plant from pool plant status, and, if so withdrawn, such plant may not requalify under this subdivision prior to the next following July: *Provided further*, That qualification for pooling under this subdivision shall not affect in any way the requirements of subdivision (v) of this subparagraph for unit pooling; *And provided also*, That any plant fully regulated under another Federal order during the month may not qualify for pooling in such month under the terms of this subdivision.

(d) "Regulated plant" means (1) any pool plant, or (2) any other plant (except the plant of a producer-handler under any Federal order) with route disposition in the marketing area in the month of not less than 10 percent of its total receipts of fluid milk products and with total Class I disposition in the month or in either of the two preceding months of at least 50 percent of its total receipts of fluid milk products in the corresponding month, unless the market administrator determines that such plant disposed of a greater proportion of its Class I milk in another marketing area on routes.

2. In § 1015.22(c), the period at the end of subparagraph (2) is changed to a colon and a proviso is added thereafter as follows:

§ 1015.22 Transfers and diversions of fluid milk products.

(c) * * *

(2) * * * *Provided*, That during the months of July through November such skim milk or butterfat so transferred or diverted shall be classified as Class I milk to the extent that it is assigned to Class I-A under Federal Order No. 2 and not subject to charges specified in § 1002.83 of such order.

3. In § 1015.41(a) the word "continental" in subparagraph (2) is changed to "the" and subparagraph (1) is revised as follows:

§ 1015.41 Computation of New England basic Class I price.

(a) * * *

(1) Divide by 1.0025 the monthly wholesale price index for all commodities as reported by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, United States Department of Labor, with the years 1957-59 as the base period.

Signed at Washington, D.C., on May 31, 1962.

JOHN P. DUNCAN, Jr.,
Assistant Secretary.

[F.R. Doc. 62-5494; Filed, June 5, 1962; 8:53 a.m.]

FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY

[14 CFR Parts 600, 601, 608]

[Airspace Docket No. 62-WA-62]

SPECIAL USE AIRSPACE, FEDERAL AIRWAYS AND CONTROLLED AIRSPACE

Proposed Revocation of Restricted Areas, Federal Airways and Control Area Extensions; Proposed Alteration of Federal Airways and Control Areas

Pursuant to the authority delegated to me by the Administrator (14 CFR 409.13), notice is hereby given that the Federal Aviation Agency is considering amendments to §§ 600.6014, 600.6102, 600.6280, 600.6079, 600.6076, 600.1618, 600.1614, 600.1630, 600.6284, 600.6060, 600.6062, 600.1540, 600.6068, 601.6280, 601.1456, and 608.63 of the regulations of the Administrator, the substance of which is stated below.

The Department of the Air Force has declared a requirement for their undergraduate pilot training activities to be conducted in segregated airspace surrounding six selected Air Force bases. The bulk of this training involves students with little or no actual flight training and it is the contention of the Air Force that this activity should be segregated from nonparticipating aircraft. The Air Training Command has indicated a requirement for segregated airspace in the amount of 8,000 square miles surrounding each location to contain this activity.

In addition to United States students, students from approximately fifty other nations undergo flight training in the Undergraduate Pilot (UPT) program. The Air Force states that approximately 6,000 student and support missions are flown monthly in jet trainers with approximately 63 sorties airborne at each base continuously during daylight hours when VFR weather conditions exist. The majority of the training sorties consist of acrobatic maneuvers performed at high speeds, which are not adaptable to air traffic control and cannot be conducted on Federal airways. The ability of the student pilot to perform maneuvers while at the same time maintaining the necessary degree of vigilance for other aircraft is problematical, and his reactions are unpredictable. The Air Force states that approximately 80 per cent of the flights are made with instructors aboard the aircraft.

The UPT program is the consolidation of all phases of undergraduate pilot training and is scheduled in three phases of instruction: Preflight, primary flight training, and basic flight training. Dur-

ing the primary and basic flight periods students perform a considerable amount of solo flight, (approximately 20 percent) and it is during these phases, considering the type of maneuvers performed, that the need for segregation from other flight activities becomes more apparent.

The effective operating range of the types of aircraft being used, T-37s, T-33s, and T-38s, and the types of training being conducted dictate the outer limits of the flight training areas. In order for the missions to be effectively accomplished, the training areas for the T-37 and T-33 type aircraft must be located within 75 nautical miles of the base.

Training activities in these aircraft which require segregation can be conducted below 23,500 feet MSL. T-38 aircraft are being phased into the program and will eventually replace the T-33s. The T-38 is capable of supersonic speeds and missions in these aircraft can be accomplished effectively in areas located within 100 nautical miles of the base. The bulk of their activity can be conducted between FL 240 and FL 450. In view of this, the Department of the Air Force has declared a requirement for 8,000 square miles of segregated airspace within 75 nautical miles of each UPT base below FL 240, and for 10,000 square miles of segregated airspace within 100 nautical miles of each UPT base above FL 240.

Since 1959 the UPT flight training at Webb AFB, Texas, and at Reese AFB, Texas, has been conducted within five restricted areas which were designated for this purpose. Training areas at the other UPT bases have been situated in a manner to avoid Federal airways. However, such off-airway areas are becoming increasingly difficult to find and, for the most part, are beyond the operating range of the aircraft used in the UPT program. The Department of the Air Force has indicated they will consider any feasible means of providing segregation, other than restricted airspace.

The problem has been carefully studied and the Federal Aviation Agency is considering the provision of the required segregation through the establishment of "Intensive Student Jet Training Areas" at each UPT base. This notice is concerned with the airspace surrounding Webb AFB, Texas, and Reese AFB, Texas.

To insure the maximum degree of safety and minimum conflict between student jet training flights and other aircraft operations, it is proposed to concurrently rescind the existing Webb/Reese Restricted Areas and describe the areas where student jet training activity requires segregation as "Intensive Student Jet Training Areas". To accomplish this, it is proposed to realign certain low and intermediate altitude airways adjacent to and through the proposed areas and redefine certain airways with maximum authorized altitudes (beneath the floor of the training areas) above which IFR flight will not be conducted without approval by the El Paso Center. The airway proposals contained

herein would permit uninterrupted flow of nonparticipating aircraft around the proposed training areas during times when the areas are in use.

These "Intensive Student Jet Training Areas" will be clearly depicted on all aeronautical charts. The activities being conducted within them will be described in the Airman's Guide and other aeronautical publications. These areas will be stratified by altitudes as required and are designed to have the least possible effect on Federal airways and to allow free transit below 12,000 feet MSL by nonparticipating aircraft. During the time these areas are in use, IFR flights by nonparticipating aircraft will not be cleared to transit the areas. VFR flights will not be denied access to the areas; however, they will be advised of the training activities and given traffic advisory information.

These "Intensive Student Jet Training Areas" will be used as such only for activity that cannot be conducted on a see-and-be-seen basis.

The "Intensive Student Jet Training Areas" in the low and intermediate altitude structures are proposed to extend upward from a floor of 12,000 feet MSL to an upper limit of 23,000 feet MSL. This will meet the requirements for all the T-37 type aircraft which will use a maximum altitude of 23,000 feet MSL as stated by the Air Force. Except for basic instrument maneuvers, this altitude stratum will also conform to the altitude requirements for the T-33 type aircraft. The floor of 12,000 feet MSL will provide airspace beneath the areas for general aviation. A floor below this limit in the Webb/Reese area would cause the pilots of light aircraft to operate in lower levels of considerable turbulence during the summer months.

The high altitude "Intensive Student Jet Training Area" is proposed to be stratified procedurally to provide maximum airspace utilization for nonparticipating aircraft.

The Air Force states a requirement for 8,000 square miles for each UPT base below FL 240. This amounts to a total of 16,000 square miles for both Webb and Reese Air Force Bases. The areas specified in this proposal will provide a total of approximately 13,390 square miles in the strata up to 23,000 feet MSL. The high altitude stratum provides approximately 7,750 square miles. The low/intermediate altitude areas are within 75 nautical miles of the respective bases, and the high-altitude areas meet the 100-nautical-mile requirement.

The proposed "Intensive Student Jet Training Areas" for Webb and Reese Air Force Bases and the associated proposed realignment and redescription of airways for each are described as follows:

LOW AND INTERMEDIATE ALTITUDE STRATA

1. *Reese One.* Rescind existing R-6304 and depict on charts an "Intensive Student Jet Training Area" to be identified as Reese One. This area contains 1,450 square miles with a floor at 12,000 feet MSL and a top at 23,000 feet MSL.

To facilitate the flow of IFR traffic around and under this area, it is proposed to realign V-102, V-14, V-1618 as

direct between the Roswell, New Mexico, and Lubbock, Texas, VORs and to rescind the south alternate of V-14 from Roswell to Lubbock.

Traffic along V-60S and V-62S between Texico, N. Mex., and Lubbock, Tex., can use altitudes up to and including 11,000 feet MSL at all times and above 11,000 feet only when training activities are not being conducted.

At this time, V-1618 between Roswell and Lubbock is unusable during periods when Reese Air Force Base is using R-6304 or R-6305; V-1618 encroaches upon both of these restricted areas. The proposed realignment of V-1618 and the proposed boundaries of the training areas will resolve this encroachment.

Adoption of these proposals will:

(1) Provide direct low and intermediate altitude airways between Roswell and Lubbock, and

(2) Allow Reese AFB aircraft to effect more efficient utilization of an enlarged training area northwest of the base.

2. *Reese Two.* Rescind existing R-6305 and R-6307 and depict on charts an "Intensive Student Jet Training Area" to be identified as Reese Two. This area contains 3,650 square miles with a floor at 12,000 feet MSL and a top at 23,000 feet MSL.

To facilitate the flow of IFR traffic around and under this area, it is proposed to realign V-1614 from over Salt Flat, Texas, VOR to the Carlsbad, New Mexico, VOR, thence via the Carlsbad VOR 009° M radial to intercept the Roswell, New Mexico, VOR 068° M radial; thence via the proposed realigned V-1618 radials to the Lubbock VOR.

This realignment will reduce the distance between Salt Flat and Lubbock by five miles as compared to the present route via Hobbs and the Welch Intersection.

IFR traffic along Victor 79 and 79 west alternate will continue to be cleared at altitudes below the base of the training areas when they are in use.

The segment of V-1540 between Wink, Texas, VOR and Big Spring, Texas, VOR encroaches upon a small portion of the southern part of the proposed training area. This encroachment would be resolved by realigning V-1540 from the Wink VOR via the intersection of the Wink VOR 057° M (068° T) and the Big Spring VOR 245° M (256° T) radials to the Big Spring VOR.

Adoption of these proposals will:

(1) Result in reduced intermediate altitude airline mileage between the Salt Flat and Lubbock VORs, and

(2) Provide more efficient utilization of airspace for the UPT program.

3. *Webb/Reese Three.* Rescind existing R-6308 and depict on charts an "Intensive Student Jet Training Area" to be identified as Webb/Reese Three. This area contains 4,251 square miles with a floor at 12,000 MSL and a top at 23,000 MSL. (R-6308 is presently jointly used by Webb and Reese and it appears practicable to continue this arrangement.)

Intermediate altitude airway V-1622 extends in part between the Lubbock VOR and the Abilene VOR and encroaches upon R-6308. The training

area boundaries are proposed so that there will be no encroachment on this airway.

Except for V-76 North and V-1630 between the Lubbock VOR and the Big Spring VOR, there will be no encroachment on Federal airways. IFR traffic filing via V-1630 between Lubbock and Big Spring is currently being rerouted via V-1541 and V-1540, or via V-1541 to Midland and V-1550 to points south of Big Spring. It is proposed to designate V-76 North alternate between Lubbock and Big Spring VORs so that altitudes above 11,500 would be employed for IFR traffic only during those periods when the proposed training area is not in use. V-1630 between Lubbock and Big Spring VORs would be employed by the El Paso ARTC Center only during those periods when the proposed training area is not in use.

Adoption of these proposals will provide:

(1) Adequate training area in close proximity to Webb AFB, and

(2) Unrestricted use of V-1622 between Lubbock and Big Spring.

4. *Webb One.* Rescind existing R-6306 and depict on charts an "Intensive Student Jet Training Area" to be identified as Webb One. This area contains 2,900 square miles with a floor at 12,000 MSL and a top at 23,000 MSL.

The southern boundary of R-6306 encroaches upon intermediate altitude airway V-1542 between the Fort Stockton VORTAC and the Junction VOR. The proposed boundaries of the training area will clear V-1542.

The floor of R-6306 is established at 10,000 feet MSL. The proposed floor of the training area is 12,000 feet MSL. This will provide additional usable altitudes for IFR traffic using V-68S between Midland and San Angelo and V-284N between Fort Stockton and San Angelo. It will also provide higher altitudes for VFR flights operating beneath the area, where turbulence is prevalent during summer months.

It is proposed to redesignate V-68 south alternate as from the Midland VOR via the intersection of the Midland VOR 128° and the San Angelo VOR 278° True radials, to the San Angelo VOR.

It is proposed to designate the above segments of V-284 North and V-68 South so that altitudes above 11,500 would be employed for IFR traffic only during those periods when the proposed training area is not in use.

Adoption of these proposals will provide:

(1) Adequate clearance of intermediate altitude airway V-1542,

(2) Additional usable altitudes for light aircraft to avoid turbulence, and

(3) Permit continuous use of all altitudes below 11,500 feet and use of the altitudes above 11,500 when training activities are not in progress.

5. *Webb Two.* Depict on charts an "Intensive Student Jet Training Area" to be identified as Webb Two southeast of Webb AFB with a floor of 12,000 feet MSL on the upper limit of 23,000 feet MSL. This area will include some 1,175 square miles.

This area would encroach upon low altitude airways V-76 North and V-76

between the Big Spring VOR and the San Angelo VOR and upon intermediate altitude airway V-1630 between Big Spring and San Angelo. It is proposed to rescind V-76 North between Big Spring and San Angelo. IFR traffic on V-76 between Big Spring and San Angelo will be assigned altitudes of 11,000 feet MSL and below while training activities are in progress. IFR traffic filed on V-1630 from San Angelo over Big Spring to Lubbock, or points north of Lubbock, will be rerouted via V-1550 between San Angelo and Midland and via V-1541 between Midland and Lubbock. The El Paso Center is currently rerouting intermediate altitude traffic via these routes while R-6308 is in use by the Air Force. It is proposed to designate the above segment of V-76 so that altitudes above 11,500 feet would be employed for IFR traffic only during those periods when the proposed training area is not in use. V-1630 between San Angelo and Big Spring would be employed by the El Paso ARTC Center only during those periods when the proposed training area is not in use.

Adoption of these proposals would:

- (1) Increase the training area for Webb AFB UPT use by 1,175 square miles,
- (2) Require rescission of V-76 North between Big Spring and San Angelo (presently proposed), and
- (3) Not seriously affect IFR users.

HIGH ALTITUDE STRATA

1. *Reese Four.* Depict on charts a high altitude "Intensive Student Jet Training Area" north of jet route J-4 in the area between Webb and Reese Air Force Bases. This area will be stratified procedurally into layers to provide maximum airspace utilization for nonparticipating aircraft.

The area which includes 7,750 square miles is designed so that it does not conflict with any existing jet routes.

It is not intended that the high altitude area north of J-4 be used solely by Reese AFB at the present time. The Air Training Command has agreed to cooperate to their maximum capability by combining the activities of the two bases into the same area where possible. Also, they will make use of only the minimum number of areas that are required.

Since there is no stated requirement for segregation of the flying activity that may be conducted at night, it is proposed that the depiction of all the intensive Student Jet Training Areas include, "Normally Used During Daylight Hours, Monday through Friday." Their actual use will be disseminated by the El Paso Center daily to the FAA Flight Service Stations within, and adjacent to, the areas and to the adjacent Air Route Traffic Control Centers.

This will allow nonparticipating jet aircraft to make planned use of the areas during the night hours and, of course, during the daytime hours when the areas are not in use.

The training areas are designed to contain the training activity that requires segregation from nonparticipating aircraft. Transition of the student aircraft between the bases and the training

areas will be conducted under VFR conditions on a see-and-be-seen basis, using the appropriate VFR hemispherical altitudes or flight levels.

A congestion of VFR student jet traffic exists on, or adjacent to, Federal airways at Reese AFB, Webb AFB, and Colorado City Auxiliary Airport at Colorado City, Texas, and at Terry County Air Force Auxiliary Airport located 23 nautical miles southwest of Reese AFB. Practice holding, jet penetrations and approaches to runways are performed at these airports.

Air Force representatives have however expressed the opinion that complete segregation is not necessary at these airports since the jet aircraft will have completed their penetration turns before descending below the floor of the training areas. They have advised that the remaining flight path to the airport will not require unusual maneuvers that would necessitate segregation from nonparticipating aircraft.

This type of activity being conducted outside of the training areas will continue to be published in the Airman's Guide.

Since the proposal to alter V-14 between Roswell, New Mexico, and Lubbock, Texas, rescinds a segment of an airway being utilized by aircraft flying between Roswell and Texico, New Mexico, it is proposed to alter V-280 between Roswell and Texico VOR as follows: Roswell, N. Mex., VOR; intersection of the Roswell VOR 063° and the Texico VOR 216° True radials; Texico VOR, including a south alternate from the Roswell VOR via the intersection of the Roswell VOR 080° and the Texico 216° True radials.

The geographic descriptions of the proposed intensive Student Jet Training Areas to be depicted on all aeronautical charts are listed below. Lack of prominent ground terrain features, because its location is in the Staked Plains area of West Texas, makes the use of geographic coordinates necessary.

1. Name: Reese One Intensive Student Jet Training Area—

Boundary: Beginning at latitude 33°46'00" N., longitude 103°21'00" W.; to latitude 34°01'15" N., longitude 103°02'45" W.; counterclockwise along the arc of a 30-mile radius circle centered at latitude 34°23'01" N., longitude 103°18'58" W.; to latitude 34°19'00" N., longitude 102°48'00" W.; to latitude 34°19'00" N., longitude 102°40'00" W.; to latitude 34°01'00" N., longitude 102°06'00" W.; to latitude 33°44'30" N., longitude 102°17'00" W.; to latitude 33°39'30" N., longitude 102°53'00" W.; to latitude 33°41'00" N., longitude 102°53'00" W.; to latitude 33°39'00" N., longitude 103°21'00" W.; to the point of beginning.

2. Name: Reese Two Intensive Student Jet Training Area—

Boundary: Beginning at latitude 33°37'00" N., longitude 102°01'00" W.; to latitude 33°30'00" N., longitude 102°51'00" W.; to latitude 33°29'00" N., longitude 102°51'00" W.; to latitude 33°24'30" N., longitude 103°14'00" W.; to latitude 33°22'00" N., longitude 103°30'00" W.; to latitude 32°57'00" N., longitude 103°26'00" W.; to latitude 32°56'00" N., longitude 103°00'00" W.; to latitude 32°32'00" N., longitude 102°44'00" W.; to latitude 32°20'00" N., longitude 102°28'00" W.; to latitude 32°20'25" N., longitude 102°13'30" W.; to the point of beginning.

3. Name: Webb/Reese Three Intensive Student Jet Training Area—

Boundary: Beginning at latitude 32°35'00" N., longitude 100°12'00" W.; to latitude 32°57'00" N., longitude 100°24'00" W.; to latitude 33°24'00" N., longitude 100°44'00" W.; to latitude 33°34'00" N., longitude 101°44'00" W.; to latitude 33°28'00" N., longitude 101°51'30" W.; to latitude 32°35'30" N., longitude 102°00'00" W.; to latitude 32°31'30" N., longitude 101°43'45" W.; clockwise along an arc of a circle with a 15 nautical mile radius centered on the Big Spring, Texas, VOR to latitude 32°28'40" N., longitude 101°12'40" W.; to latitude 32°32'00" N., longitude 100°28'00" W.; to the point of beginning.

4. Name: Webb One Intensive Student Jet Training Area—

Boundary: Beginning at latitude 31°31'00" N., longitude 102°45'00" W.; to latitude 31°01'00" N., longitude 102°15'00" W.; to latitude 30°55'00" N., longitude 101°26'00" W.; to latitude 31°13'00" N., longitude 100°55'00" W.; to latitude 31°28'00" N., longitude 100°55'00" W.; to latitude 31°48'00" N., longitude 101°50'00" W.; to latitude 31°31'45" N., longitude 102°02'00" W.; clockwise along the arc of a 30 nautical mile radius circle centered at the Midland, Texas, VOR to latitude 31°37'30" N., longitude 102°33'30" W.; to the point of beginning.

5. Name: Webb Two Intensive Student Jet Training Area—

Boundary: Beginning at latitude 31°37'00" N., longitude 100°52'00" W.; to latitude 31°37'00" N., longitude 100°26'00" W.; to latitude 32°08'00" N., longitude 100°09'30" W.; to latitude 32°05'30" N., longitude 100°45'00" W.; to latitude 31°57'00" N., longitude 101°16'00" W.; to latitude 31°43'00" N., longitude 101°06'00" W.; to the point of beginning.

6. Name: Reese Four Intensive Student Jet Training Area—

Boundary: Beginning at latitude 32°44'00" N., longitude 103°46'00" W.; to latitude 32°30'00" N., longitude 103°30'00" W.; to latitude 32°24'00" N., longitude 102°55'00" W.; to latitude 32°33'00" N., longitude 102°00'00" W.; to latitude 32°33'00" N., longitude 100°29'00" W.; to latitude 32°58'00" N., longitude 100°29'00" W.; to latitude 33°20'00" N., longitude 100°43'00" W.; to latitude 33°19'00" N., longitude 103°46'00" W.; to the point of beginning.

The above described Intensive Student Jet Training Areas will be operated under the following conditions:

1. All student jet training flights will be conducted only during VFR weather conditions.

2. Each day, excluding Saturday and Sunday, before beginning student flight training, Webb AFB and Reese AFB shall notify the El Paso ARTC Center of their requirements for specific areas, including time of usage and the maximum flight level to be utilized in Reese Four area. When any or all training areas are required during periods other than specified above, the Webb or Reese AFB shall notify the ARTC Center at least 24 hours in advance. Upon termination of use of any, or all, of the training areas, Webb or Reese AFB shall immediately notify the ARTC Center.

3. FAA Flight Service Stations within 100 nautical miles of Webb AFB or Reese AFB shall broadcast, following each scheduled weather broadcast, information concerning the operations status of each Intensive Student Jet Training Area from sunrise to sunset Monday through Friday.

4. When the training areas are to be used during times other than sunrise to

sunset Monday through Friday, the ARTC Center shall notify the appropriate Flight Service Stations to resume broadcasting information concerning the usage of specified training areas.

5. The Reese AFB Tower and Webb AFB Tower shall provide traffic advisory information upon request during periods when the training areas are in use by the Air Force.

6. Transition of jet traffic between "Intensive Student Jet Training Areas" shall be in accordance with appropriate hemispherical altitudes or flight levels.

7. Terms of use for the proposed "Intensive Student Jet Training Areas" will be set forth in Letters of Agreement between the El Paso ARTC Center and appropriate military authority.

Accordingly, the Federal Aviation Agency is considering the following actions:

1. Revoke the following restricted areas:

R-6304 Reese AFB, Texas.
R-6305 Reese AFB, Texas.
R-6306 Webb AFB, Texas.
R-6307 Webb AFB, Texas.
R-6308 Webb AFB, Texas.

2. Alter the segment of VOR Federal airway No. 1618 which is presently designated from the Roswell, N. Mex., VOR; as a 16-mile wide airway via the intersection of the Roswell VOR 063° and the Lubbock, Texas, VOR 277° True radials to the Lubbock VOR. It is proposed to realign this airway segment from the Roswell VOR, 10-mile wide airway to the intersection of the Roswell VOR 080° and the Texico, N. Mex., VOR 212° True radials; thence 14-mile wide airway to the intersection of the Lubbock VOR 262° and the Hobbs, N. Mex., VOR 003° True radials; thence 12-mile wide airway to the intersection of the Lubbock VOR 262° and the Hobbs VOR 014° True radials; thence 10-mile wide airway to the Lubbock VOR. This would provide a shorter route by aligning the airway segment direct from Roswell to Lubbock.

3. Alter the segment of Intermediate altitude VOR Federal airway No. 1614 which is presently designated from the Salt Flat, Texas, VOR as a 16-mile wide airway via the intersection of the Salt Flat VOR 055° and the Hobbs VOR 242° True radials; to the Hobbs VOR; thence 10-mile wide airway via the intersection of the Hobbs VOR 077° and the Lubbock VOR 188° True radials; to the Lubbock VOR. It is proposed to realign this airway segment from the Salt Flat VOR as a 16-mile wide airway to the Carlsbad, N. Mex., VOR; thence 10-mile wide airway to the intersection of the Carlsbad VOR 021° and the Roswell VOR 115° True radials; thence 14-mile wide airway to the intersection of the Carlsbad VOR 021° and the Roswell VOR 089° True radials; thence 16-mile wide airway to the intersection of the Carlsbad VOR 021° and the Roswell VOR 080° True radials; thence 14-mile wide airway to the intersection of the Roswell VOR 080° and the Hobbs VOR 003° True radials; thence 12-mile wide airway to the intersection of the Lubbock VOR 262° and the Hobbs VOR 014° True radials; thence 10-mile wide airway to

the Lubbock VOR. This realignment would reduce the route mileage between Salt Flat and Lubbock by approximately 5 miles and would facilitate the movement of air traffic between these points upon the establishment of the "Reese Two" Intensive Student Jet Training Area.

4. Alter the segment of Intermediate altitude VOR Federal airway No. 1540 which extends in part from the Wink, Texas, VOR; 16-mile wide airway via the intersection of the Wink VOR 066° and the Big Spring, Texas, VOR 260° True radials to the Big Spring VOR. It is proposed to realign this airway segment from the Wink VOR; as a 16-mile wide airway via the intersection of the Wink VOR 068° and the Big Spring VOR 256° True radials to the Big Spring VOR. This realignment would provide lateral separation between Victor 1540 and the proposed "Reese Two" Intensive Student Jet Training Area.

5. Redesignate the segment of Intermediate altitude VOR Federal airway No. 1630 from the Lubbock VOR via the Big Spring VOR to the San Angelo, Texas, VOR as being available during the periods when employed by the El Paso, Texas, Air Route Traffic Control Center. This would permit use of this airway segment during the periods when the "Webb/Reese Three" and "Webb Two" proposed Intensive Student Jet Training Areas are not being utilized for their established purpose.

6. Alter the segment of Low altitude VOR Federal airway No. 14 which extends in part from the Roswell, N. Mex., VOR via the intersection of the Roswell VOR 063° and the Lubbock, Texas, VORTAC 277° True radials; to the Lubbock VORTAC, including a south alternate from the Roswell VOR direct to the Lubbock VORTAC. It is proposed to revoke the south alternate and redesignate Victor 14 from the Roswell VOR direct to the Lubbock VORTAC. This would permit operations to be conducted along Victor 14 simultaneously with activities within "Reese One" and "Reese Two" Intensive Student Jet Training Areas.

7. Alter the segment of Low altitude VOR Federal airway No. 68 south alternate which extends in part from the Midland, Texas, VOR via the intersection of the Midland VOR 146° and the San Angelo, Texas, VOR 278° True radials; to the San Angelo VOR. It is proposed to redesignate this segment of Victor 68 south alternate from the Midland VOR via the intersection of the Midland VOR 128° and the San Angelo VOR 278° True radials; to the San Angelo VOR. This segment of Victor 68 South would be designated so that altitudes above 11,500 feet MSL would be employed for IFR traffic only during those periods when the proposed training area is not in use. This would permit operations to be conducted along Victor 68 simultaneously with activities within "Webb One" Intensive Student Jet Training Area below 11,500 feet and above 11,500 when the training area is not in use.

8. Alter the segment of Low altitude VOR Federal airway No. 102 which extends in part from the Roswell VOR via

the intersection of the Roswell VOR 080° and the Texico, N. Mex., VOR 216° True radials, the intersection of the Texico VOR 216° and the Lubbock VORTAC 277° True radials; to the Lubbock VORTAC. It is proposed to realign this segment of Victor 102 from the Roswell VOR direct to the Lubbock VORTAC. This would align Victor 102 with the proposed alignment of Victor 14 and permit operations to be conducted along the airways simultaneously with activities within "Reese One" and "Reese Two" Intensive Student Jet Training Areas.

9. Alter Low altitude VOR Federal airway No. 280 which extends in part from the Roswell VOR via the intersection of the Roswell VOR 080° and the Texico VOR 216° True radials; to the Texico VOR. It is proposed to redesignate this segment of Victor 280 and its associated control areas from the Roswell VOR via the intersection of the Roswell VOR 063° and the Texico VOR 216° True radials; to the Texico VOR, including a south alternate via the intersection of the Roswell VOR 080° and the Texico VOR 216° True radials. This altered segment of Victor 280 would replace the revoked segment of Victor 14 between Roswell VOR and the intersection of the Roswell VOR 063° and the Texico VOR 216° True radials and permit retention of the more direct route between Roswell and Texico. The proposed south alternate would provide an airway for aircraft to climb to and descend from assigned altitudes on Victor 280.

10. Alter Low altitude VOR Federal airway No. 79 which extends in part from the Hobbs, N. Mex., VOR via the intersection of the Hobbs VOR 077° and the Lubbock VORTAC 188° True radials (Welch Intersection); to the Lubbock VORTAC, including a west alternate from the Hobbs VOR direct to the Lubbock VORTAC. It is proposed to designate Victor 79 between Hobbs VOR and the Welch Intersection so that altitudes above 11,500 would be employed for IFR traffic only during those periods when the proposed training area is not in use. Victor 79 west alternate between Hobbs VOR and Lubbock VORTAC would be similarly designated. This would permit operation to be conducted along the airways simultaneously with activities within "Reese Two" Intensive Student Jet Training Area below 11,500 and above 11,500 when training activities are not being conducted.

11. Alter Low altitude VOR Federal airway No. 76 which extends in part from the Lubbock VORTAC via the intersection of the Lubbock VORTAC 188° and the Big Spring VOR 286° True radials to the Big Spring VOR, including a north alternate from the Lubbock VORTAC direct to the Big Spring VOR; San Angelo VOR; including a north alternate from the Big Spring VOR via the intersection of the Big Spring VOR 124° and the San Angelo VOR 024° True radials. It is proposed to revoke the north alternate between Big Spring and San Angelo and so designate the main airway between Big Spring and San Angelo and the north alternate between Lubbock and Big Spring so that altitudes above 11,500 would be employed for IFR traffic only

during those periods when the proposed training area is not in use. The north alternate between Big Spring and San Angelo is seldom used for IFR traffic and is unjustified as an assignment of airspace.

12. Alter Low altitude VOR Federal airway No. 284 north alternate which extends in part from the Fort Stockton, Texas, VORTAC to the San Angelo VOR. It is proposed to designate this segment of Victor 284 north alternate so that altitudes above 11,500 would be employed for IFR traffic only during those periods when the proposed training area is not in use. This would permit operations to be conducted along the airway below 11,500 simultaneously with activities within "Webb One" Intensive Student Jet Training Area and above 11,500 when the training area is not in use.

13. Alter Low altitude VOR Federal airway Nos. 60 and 62 south alternates which extend in part from the Lubbock VORTAC to the Texico VOR by designating the airspace above 11,500 along these segments similar to the above segments of V-284 and V-284 North. This would permit operations to be conducted along the airway segments below 11,500 simultaneously with activities within "Reese One" Intensive Student Jet Training Area and above 11,500 when training is not being conducted. With the exception of Victor 280, the control areas associated with these airway segments are so designated that they would automatically conform to the altered airways. The vertical extent of these control areas would remain as designated pending review of the adjacent airways. Separate actions will be initiated to implement on an area basis amendment 60-21 to Part 60 of the Civil Air Regulations.

14. Revoke § 601.1456 *Control Area Extension (El Paso, Texas) (Webb/Reese Areas)*.

The proposals in this notice have been informally discussed with representatives of a majority of the aviation organizations and the Air Force. In view of this, and due to the need for expediency in this case, it is felt that fifteen days will be sufficient time for comments on the notice.

Interested persons may submit such written data, views or arguments as they may desire. Communications should be submitted in triplicate to the Chief, Airspace Utilization Division, Federal Aviation Agency, Washington 25, D.C. All communications received within fifteen days after publication of this notice in the FEDERAL REGISTER will be considered before action is taken on the proposed amendments. No public hearing is contemplated at this time, but arrangements for informal conferences with Federal Aviation Agency officials may be made by contacting the Chief, Airspace Utilization Division, Federal Aviation Agency, Washington 25, D.C. Any data, views or arguments presented during such conference must also be submitted in writing in accordance with this notice in order to become part of the record for consideration. The proposal contained in this notice may be changed in the light of comments received.

The official Docket will be available for examination by interested persons at the Docket Section, Federal Aviation Agency, Room B-316, 1711 New York Avenue NW., Washington 25, D.C.

This amendment is proposed under section 307(a) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 749; 49 U.S.C. 1348).

Issued in Washington, D.C., on June 4, 1962.

CLIFFORD P. BURTON,
Chief, Airspace Utilization Division.

[F.R. Doc. 62-5495; Filed, June 5, 1962;
8:53 a.m.]

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

[47 CFR Parts 2, 91]

[Docket No. 14657; FCC 62-576]

AERONAUTICAL MULTICOM STATION

Proposed New Class of Station

In the matter of amendment of Parts 2 and 9 of the Commission's rules to establish a new class of station operating on the frequency 122.9 Mc/s, called aeronautical multicom station, Docket No. 14657.

1. Notice of proposed rule making in the above-entitled matter is hereby given.

2. The Commission receives numerous requests for permission to use the aviation safety frequencies, 108-135 Mc/s, for purposes in addition to the safety of aircraft. Such requests have come from persons engaged in activities such as aerial application, forest fire fighting, parachute jumping and others engaged in activities involving ground-to-air and air-to-air communications not provided for in the Aviation Services. In addition, the National Aviation Trades Association (NATA) has recently submitted a request along similar lines. Further, the Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association (AOPA) has requested use of the frequency 122.9 Mc/s for air-to-air communications to relieve congestion on 122.8 Mc/s.

3. For the most part, the reason given for the requests is that in order for an aircraft to communicate in both the Aviation Services and other services, it would be necessary to install two entirely separate stations aboard the aircraft since transmitters are not generally available which are both (a) type accepted in the Aviation Services and another service and (b) capable of selection of a channel in either of the services without extensive transmitter adjustments.

4. In view of these requirements, it is proposed that a frequency presently allocated for the aeronautical service be made available for communications relating to activities enumerated in Paragraph 2. The frequency would be available to private aircraft to communicate with other private aircraft and with aeronautical multicom stations. The frequency 122.9 Mc/s appears to be appropriate for this purpose since it is

presently allocated for use by private aircraft stations and most of the aircraft radio stations currently in use have this frequency capability. In addition, this frequency presently is not used to capacity. This frequency, like other aviation frequencies, will be assigned on a shared basis with the licensees being responsible for conducting their operations in such a way as to minimize harmful interference to other licensees and thereby make the most effective use of the frequency. The name "Multicom" is a contraction of the words multiple communications. It was selected because it affords a brief, distinctive and descriptive name of the service to be provided by the station.

5. In view of the above, it is proposed to amend the Commission's rules to make the frequency 122.9 Mc/s available to a new class of ground station, aeronautical multicom stations, for communications with private aircraft stations. Section 9.331 is proposed to be amended to allow communications between private aircraft in flight, and between private aircraft stations and aeronautical multicom stations in accordance with the scope of service for the latter class of station as set forth below.

6. Comments are invited particularly to the provisions of § 9.1504 *Scope of service*. This section sets forth the categories of persons who may use the service and the types of communications which they may transmit.

7. The proposed amendments to the Rules, as set forth below, are issued pursuant to the authority contained in section 303 (a), (b), (c), (f), and (r) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended.

8. Pursuant to applicable procedures set forth in § 1.213 of the Commission's rules, interested persons may file comments on or before June 26, 1962, and reply comments on or before July 6, 1962. All relevant and timely comments and reply comments will be considered by the Commission before final action is taken in this proceeding. In reaching its decision in this proceeding, the Commission may also take into account other relevant information before it, in addition to the specific comments invited by this notice.

9. In accordance with the provisions of § 1.54 of the Commission's rules, an original and 14 copies of all statements, briefs, or comments filed shall be furnished the Commission.

Adopted: May 29, 1962.

Released: June 1, 1962.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS
COMMISSION,
[SEAL] BEN F. WAPLE,
Acting Secretary.

1. Footnote US31 to § 2.106 is amended to read as follows:

§ 2.106 Table of frequency allocations.

US31 The band 121.975-123.075 Mc/s is for use by private aircraft stations. In addition, the frequencies 122.8 and 123.0 Mc/s may be used by aeronautical advisory stations and the frequency 122.9 Mc/s may be used by aeronautical multicom stations.

2. Section 9.3 is amended to add the following definitions in alphabetical order:

§ 9.3 Definition of terms.

* * * * *

Aeronautical multicom land station. An aeronautical station operating in the aeronautical multicom service.

Aeronautical multicom mobile station. A mobile station operating in the aeronautical multicom service.

Aeronautical multicom service. A mobile service not open to public correspondence, used to provide communications essential to conduct of activities being performed by or directed from private aircraft.

3. Section 9.193 is amended to read as follows:

§ 9.193 Permissible communications.

All ground stations in the aviation services shall transmit only communications for the safe, expeditious and economical operation of aircraft and the protection of life and property in the air: *Provided, however,* That aeronautical public service stations, aeronautical advisory stations, aeronautical multicom stations, and Civil Air Patrol land and mobile stations may communicate in accordance with the particular section of this part which govern the operation of these classes of stations, and any station in the Aviation Services in Alaska, regardless of class in which licensed, may transmit messages concerning sickness, death, weather, ice conditions, or other matters relating to safety of life and property if:

(a) There is no established means of communication between the points in question;

(b) No charge is made for the communication service; and

(c) A copy of each message so transmitted is kept on file at the transmitting station in accordance with § 9.153.

4. In § 9.331, paragraphs (b) and (c) are amended to read as follows:

§ 9.331 Frequencies available.

* * * * *

(b) These frequencies are available to private aircraft for air traffic control operations: 122.00, 122.05, 122.10, 122.15, 122.20, 122.25, 122.30, 122.35, 122.40, 122.45, 122.50, 122.55, 122.60, 122.65, 122.70, 122.75, 122.85, 122.95, and 123.05 Mc/s.

(c) 122.9 Mc/s, 6A3 emission: Private aircraft stations in accordance with the scope of service set forth in § 9.1504. Between private aircraft stations while in flight for communications pertaining to safety; agricultural, ranching and conservation activities; forest fire fighting; aerial application; aerial advertising; and parachute jumping.

5. Part 9 is amended by the addition of the following new Subpart Y:

Subpart Y—Aeronautical Multicom Stations

Sec.

9.1501 Frequency available.

9.1502 Power output.

9.1503 Eligibility.

9.1504 Scope of service.

§ 9.1501 Frequency available.

122.9 Mc/s, 6A3 emission: This frequency is available on the condition that no harmful interference is caused to the aeronautical advisory service.

§ 9.1502 Power output.

The power output of aeronautical multicom stations shall not exceed 10 watts.

§ 9.1503 Eligibility.

An authorization for an aeronautical multicom station will be granted only to a person requiring communications within the scope of service for this class of station. A showing, satisfactory to the Commission, of the need for such communication shall accompany each application for license.

§ 9.1504 Scope of service.

Communications pertaining to agricultural, ranching, and conservation activities; forest fire fighting; aerial application; aerial advertising; and parachute jumping are permitted. Such communications shall be limited to the directing of ground activities from the air, the directing of aerial activities from the ground and air-to-air communications where such communications are otherwise not provided for in the part: *Provided, however,* That applicants unable to meet the special requirements for aeronautical advisory stations under § 9.1001, and at locations where Aeronautical Advisory Service is not available, may be authorized, upon proper showing to the Commission, to conduct communications, on the frequency 122.9 Mc/s, in accordance with the following provisions:

(a) Shall not be used for air traffic control purposes;

(b) Shall be limited to the necessities of safe and expeditious operation of private aircraft, pertaining to the conditions of runways, types of fuel available, wind conditions, weather information, dispatching or other necessary information: *Provided, however,* That on a secondary basis, communications may be transmitted which pertain to the efficient portal-to-portal transit of which the flight is a portion, such as requests for ground transportation and food or lodging required during transit.

[F.R. Doc. 62-5479; Filed, June 5, 1962; 8:50 a.m.]

[47 CFR Parts 2, 9]

[Docket No. 14656; FCC 62-575]

CIVIL AIR PATROL STATIONS

Proposed Use of Certain Frequency

In the matter of amendment of Parts 2 and 9 of the Commission's rules to

provide for the use of the frequency 26.62 Mc/s for Civil Air Patrol stations in the United States, Docket No. 14656.

1. Notice is hereby given of proposed rule making in the above-entitled matter.

2. The Commission is in receipt of a letter from the Department of the Air Force requesting that the Commission's rules be amended to make the frequency 26.62 Mc/s available for assignment in the Continental United States to land and mobile stations of the Civil Air Patrol, the civilian adjunct of the Air Force.

3. The frequency 26.62 Mc/s is assigned nationally to government radio services. The interested Government agencies have no objection to the proposed use of the frequency by the Civil Air Patrol.

4. Authority for the proposed amendment, as set forth below, is contained in sections 4(i) and 303 (c), (f), and (r) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended.

5. Pursuant to applicable procedures set forth in § 1.213 of the Commission's rules, interested persons may file comments on or before July 9, 1962, and reply comments on or before July 19, 1962. All relevant and timely comments and reply comments will be considered by the Commission before final action is taken in this proceeding. In reaching its decision in this proceeding, the Commission may also take into account other relevant information before it, in addition to the specific comments invited by this notice.

6. In accordance with the provisions of § 1.54 of the Commission's rules, an original and fourteen copies of all statements, briefs or comments shall be furnished to the Commission.

Adopted: May 29, 1962.

Released: June 1, 1962.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS
COMMISSION,

[SEAL] BEN F. WAPLE,
Acting Secretary.

1. Footnote US10 to § 2.106 of the Commission's rules and regulations is amended to read as follows:

§ 2.106 Table of frequency allocations.

* * * * *

US10 The use of the frequencies 26.62 Mc/s (in all areas), 143.91 Mc/s (in the continental United States excluding Alaska), and 148.14 Mc/s (in all areas) may be authorized to Civil Air Patrol land stations and Civil Air Patrol mobile stations on the condition that harmful interference will not be caused to Government stations.

2. Section 9.912(g) is amended to read as follows:

§ 9.912 Frequencies available.

* * * * *

(g) 26.62 Mc/s, A-3 emission, 5 watts maximum power. In the state of Hawaii, A-1, A-2, A-3 emission 250 watts maximum power is permissible.

[F.R. Doc. 62-5480; Filed, June 5, 1962; 8:50 a.m.]

[47 CFR Parts 2, 9]

[Docket No. 14655; FCC 62-573]

AIRBORNE DOPPLER RADARS

Proposed Deletion of Temporary Band Provision

In the matter of amendment of Parts 2 and 9 of the Commission's rules and regulations to delete the temporary provision for airborne Doppler radars in the band 9750-9850 Mc/s, Docket No. 14655.

1. The Commission adopted a Memorandum Opinion and Order on April 16, 1958 (FCC 58-379), published in the FEDERAL REGISTER on April 23, 1958 (23 F.R. 2676), which, among other things, amended Parts 2 and 9 of the Commission's rules to provide temporarily for the use of Government and non-Government airborne Doppler radars in the bands 8750-8850 Mc/s and 9750-9850 Mc/s until moved to frequency bands allocated to the Aeronautical Radionavigation Service.

2. On July 30, 1958, the Commission adopted a First Report and Order in Docket 12404 (FCC 58-750), published in the FEDERAL REGISTER on August 9, 1958 (23 F.R. 6111), which allocated the band 13,250-13,400 Mc/s to the Aeronautical Radionavigation Service for the exclusive use of Government and non-Government airborne Doppler radars.

3. The Third Memorandum Opinion and Order in Docket 13928 (FCC 62-276) adopted by the Commission on March 15, 1962, and published in the FEDERAL REGISTER on March 23, 1962 (27 F.R. 2735), amended footnote US53 of the Table of Frequency Allocations in Part 2 to permit the use of airborne Doppler radars in the 8750-8850 Mc/s band, subject to any interference which may be experienced from stations in the Radiolocation Service in the band 8500-10,000 Mc/s.

4. It should be noted that the Geneva (1959) Radio Regulations make no provision for the use of the 9750-9850 Mc/s band by airborne Doppler navigation aids, this band being allocated to the Radiolocation Service.

5. In view of the foregoing and the Commission's belief that there is no present or proposed use of the band 9750-9850 Mc/s for Doppler navigation aids, and to align the national allocation of this band with the Geneva (1959) Radio Regulations, the Commission proposes to amend § 2.106 by deleting the Footnote designator US57 in Column 6 opposite 9500-10,000 Mc/s in Column 5 and by deleting Footnote US57 in the

Table; § 9.312 is amended by deleting paragraph (w).

6. All interested persons are invited to file, on or before July 6, 1962, comments supporting or opposing the proposal set out in this notice, or outlining any modifications or counter-proposals the parties may wish to submit. Comments in reply thereto may be submitted on or before July 16, 1962. The Commission will consider all comments filed hereunder prior to taking final action in this matter provided that, notwithstanding the provisions of § 1.213 of the rules, the Commission will not be limited solely to the comments filed in this proceeding.

7. Authority for the amendments is contained in sections 4(i) and 303 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended.

8. In accordance with the provisions of § 1.54 of the Commission's rules and regulations, the original and 14 copies of all statements, briefs or comments filed shall be furnished the Commission.

Adopted: May 29, 1962.

Released: June 1, 1962.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS

COMMISSION,

[SEAL] BEN F. WAPLE,
Acting Secretary.[F.R. Doc. 62-5481; Filed, June 5, 1962;
8:50 a.m.]

[47 CFR Part 3]

[Docket No. 14658 (RM-326); FCC 62-591]

TABLE OF ASSIGNMENTS FOR CERTAIN TELEVISION BROADCAST STATIONS IN PUERTO RICO

Notice of Proposed Rule Making

In the matter of amendment of § 3.606 Table of assignments, television broadcast stations (Mayaguez, Ponce, San Juan, Puerto Rico), Docket No. 14658 (RM-326).

1. Notice is hereby given of proposed rule making in the above-entitled matter.

2. The Commission has before it for consideration a petition for proposed rule making filed on April 24, 1962, by the Antilles Broadcasting Corporation, San Juan, Puerto Rico, requesting an amendment of the Television Table of Assignments, § 3.606, to permit the addition of UHF Channels 16 to Mayaguez, 22 to Ponce, and 19 to San Juan, Puerto Rico.

3. The Antilles Broadcasting Corporation requests that the Table of Assignments, Television Broadcast Stations, § 3.606 of the Commission rules, be amended with respect to the aforementioned cities as follows:

Cities	Channel No.	
	Present	Proposed
Mayaguez, P.R.-----	3+, 5-	3+, 5-, 16
Ponce, P.R.-----	7+, 9-	7+, 9-, 22
San Juan, P.R.-----	2+, 4-, *6+	2+, 4-, *6+, 19

4. The populations of Mayaguez, Ponce, and San Juan are 83,850, 145,586, and 588,805 respectively, according to the 1960 U.S. Census. Channel 12 is assigned to Aguadilla-Arecibo and is presently operating as a commercial station. This station, however, delivers a city-grade signal to Aguadilla and to Mayaguez, and the Commission has granted a waiver of § 3.652(a) of its rules to permit the station to identify itself as an Aguadilla-Mayaguez station.

5. The petitioner asserts that there are no UHF station assignments presently made to Puerto Rico and that the proposed assignments meet the separation requirements of the Commission rules. It further states that it intends to apply for authorization to operate on the three UHF channels herein petitioned for if they are assigned to Mayaguez, Ponce, and San Juan, Puerto Rico.

6. The Commission is of the view that rule making should be instituted on this proposal in order that all interested parties may submit their views and relevant data.

7. Authority for the adoption of the amendment proposed herein is contained in sections 4 (i) and (j), 303, and 307 (b) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended.

8. Pursuant to applicable procedures set out in § 1.213 of the Commission rules, interested parties may file comments on or before July 9, 1962, and reply comments on or before July 19, 1962. In reaching its decision on the rule amendment which is proposed herein, the Commission will not be limited to consideration of comments of record, but will take into account all relevant information obtained in any manner from informed sources.

9. In accordance with the provisions of § 1.54 of the rules, an original and 14 copies of all written comments and statements shall be furnished the Commission.

Adopted: May 29, 1962.

Released: June 1, 1962.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS

COMMISSION,

[SEAL] BEN F. WAPLE,
Acting Secretary.[F.R. Doc. 62-5482; Filed, June 5, 1962;
8:50 a.m.]

Notices

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau of Reclamation

[Public Announcement No. 25, Amdt. 4]

COLUMBIA BASIN PROJECT, WASHINGTON

Public Announcement of the Sale of Full-Time Farm Units

Public announcement of the sale of farm units in the South Columbia Basin Irrigation District, Columbia Basin Project, Washington, dated October 18, 1956, published in the FEDERAL REGISTER at 21 F.R. 8822, and subsequently amended, is further amended by adding to the last sentence of section 16.d. the following: " * * * except that for Farm Unit 56, Irrigation Block 16, and only that unit, the latest permissible date for initiating residence will be extended for two years."

The purpose of this amendment is to allow additional time to arrange financing for the construction of a dwelling on the farm unit.

FLOYD E. DOMINY,
Commissioner.

MAY 31, 1962.

[F.R. Doc. 62-5455; Filed, June 5, 1962;
8:46 a.m.]

Office of the Secretary

[Order 2865]

COMMISSIONER, BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS, AND AREA DIRECTOR, GALLUP AREA OFFICE, BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

Delegation of Authority To Negotiate Contracts for Construction Work

SECTION 1. Delegation. The Commissioner, Bureau of Indian Affairs, and the Area Director, Gallup Area Office, Bureau of Indian Affairs, are authorized, subject to the provisions of section 2 of this order, to exercise the authority delegated by the Administrator of General Services to the Secretary of the Interior (27 F.R. 3017) to negotiate, without advertising, under section 302(c) (10) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended (41 U.S.C. 252 et seq.), contracts for construction of irrigation work on the Mescalero Indian Reservation in New Mexico; and earth moving on the Navajo Indian Reservation in Arizona.

SEC. 2. Limitation: exercise of authority. (a) The authority delegated by section 1 of this order shall be exercised in accordance with all provisions of Title III of the Act with respect to negotiated contracts, all other provisions of law, and applicable regulations of the Department.

(b) The authority delegated by section 1 of this order shall expire on June 30, 1962.

5348

SEC. 3. Redlegation. The authority delegated by section 1 of this order may not be redelegated.

STEWART L. UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior.

MAY 29, 1962.

[F.R. Doc. 62-5456; Filed, June 5, 1962;
8:46 a.m.]

[Order 2864]

BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION

Negotiation of Contracts for Experimental Supplies and Equipment for Direct-Current Test Line and Terminals; Correction

MAY 29, 1962.

On page 3861 of the FEDERAL REGISTER dated April 21, 1962, there appears a notice of Delegation of Authority from the Secretary of the Interior to the Administrator Bonneville Power to negotiate contracts for experimental supplies and equipment for direct current test lines and terminals. The FEDERAL REGISTER citation in section 2 reading "(24 CFR 1921)" is corrected to read "(27 F.R. 3017)".

D. OTIS BEASLEY,
Administrative Assistant Secretary.

MAY 29, 1962.

[F.R. Doc. 62-5457; Filed, June 5, 1962;
8:46 a.m.]

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Agricultural Research Service ORGANIZATION, FUNCTIONS AND AUTHORITIES

I. Purpose. This memorandum outlines the basic functions, authorities and organizational structure of the Agricultural Research Service (ARS) established under Secretary's Order of December 24, 1953 (19 F.R. 74), as amended, and assignments of overall responsibilities and authorities within the Service (Administrative Memorandum 101.1). The "Notice of Organization, Functions and Authorities of the Agricultural Research Service" effective February 21, 1957 (22 F.R. 2679), as amended, is hereby superseded.

II. Functions of the Agricultural Research Service—A. Assignment of functions. The Agricultural Research Service is responsible for:

1. Coordination of research activities of the Department, including examination and analysis of such activities current and contemplated, review and approval of projects or proposals prior to initiation, advice and consultation on planning with heads of agencies, and reports and recommendations to the Secretary.

2. The following research programs: Production and utilization (except forestry) research, including research under Title I of the Research and Marketing Act of 1946 (7 U.S.C. 427 et. seq.); soil conservation, except the national soil survey; grass, and control of undesirable plants; range management (except on forest ranges and adjacent integrated non-forest lands), cotton ginning and processing; under section 7(b) of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98f); under the Housing Act of 1949 (42 U.S.C. 1471 et seq.).

3. The research, investigations, inspections, experimentations, demonstrations, development work, service and regulatory work, and control and eradication of insects, plant and animal pests and diseases provided for under the heading "Agricultural Research Administration" in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act of 1954 (except forest pests and diseases, and research on off-farm handling, transportation and storage of agricultural products including investigations of insect infestations of off-farm stored products), and the following services conducted under sections 203 and 205 of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1622 and 1624): inspection and certification, and standardization incidental thereto, of food for dogs, cats, and other carnivora, of animal byproducts not capable of use as human food, and of human food articles derived wholly or in part from meat, meat byproducts or meat food products and not subject to the Federal meat inspection laws but for which the mark of Federal meat inspection is requested, identification service for federally inspected meat, meat byproducts and meat food products, and certification service for livestock products for export for human food purposes.

4. Administration of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U.S.C. 135-135k).

5. The agricultural research and extension service programs in the Virgin Islands of the United States as provided in Public Law 228, 82nd Congress, October 29, 1951.

6. Eradication of foot-and-mouth and other contagious diseases of animals and poultry.

7. Hog Cholera Serum and Virus Marketing Agreement Act (7 U.S.C. 851-855).

8. Administration of Title III of the Research and Marketing Act (7 U.S.C. 1628-1629).

9. All administrative functions on behalf of the Secretary relating to the acquisition and administration of patent rights.

10. Administration of the provisions of section 408(1) of the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act, as added by section 3 of the Act of July 22, 1954 (Public Law 518, 83d Congress), providing for certifi-

cation with respect to certain pesticide chemicals for which tolerances or exemptions are sought.

11. Administration of responsibilities with respect to preemergency planning and emergency operations covering defense against biological and chemical warfare in relation to crops, livestock and products thereof and determination of the effects of biological and chemical warfare agents on agriculture; inspection of livestock, meat and meat products in slaughtering and processing plants subject to continuous inspection to insure wholesomeness and safety from biological and chemical warfare agents and radioactive contamination; research in support of assigned defense planning and anticipated emergency operations; information and advice concerning equipment, chemicals and other requisites needed in support of assigned activities; and organizing, equipping, and directing a Department-wide system of radiological monitoring.

12. The use, administration and disposition under Title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act (7 U.S.C. 1010-1012) and the related provisions of Title IV thereof of lands which have heretofore been transferred or which hereafter may be transferred by agreement between the interested agencies with the approval of the Assistant Secretary.

13. Administration of the Federal Plant Pest Act of May 23, 1957 (Public Law 85-36).

14. All administrative functions on behalf of the Secretary relating to radiological safety within the Department, including control of the acquisition, use and disposition, from the standpoint of radiological safety, of all materials and equipment which are sources of actual and potential radiation hazard.

15. Administration of sections 4 and 5 of the Humane Slaughter Act (Public Law 85-765).

16. Coordination of all foreign translation activities in the Department, including liaison with the National Science Foundation and other Government agencies on all matters pertaining to this program except as reserved to the Department Library and the Office of Budget and Finance.

17. Utilization research in aid of market development under section 104(a) of the Agricultural Trade and Development Act of 1954, as amended (Public Law 480, 83d Congress); and a foreign contracts and grants program of farm, forestry, marketing, and utilization research, under section 104(k) of such Act, in cooperation with Agricultural Marketing Service, Forest Service, Economic Research Service and Statistical Reporting Service, in their respective areas of responsibility. Foreign activities under this assignment are subject to the coordinating responsibilities of the Foreign Agricultural Service.

B. Reservations—1. The following are reserved to the Secretary. a. Final action on regulations under the Hog Cholera Serum and Virus Marketing Agreement Act.

b. The issuance, amendment, termination or suspension of any marketing

agreement or order or any provision thereof.

c. Designation of members of advisory committees under Title III of the Research and Marketing Act (7 U.S.C. 1628-1629).

d. Determination as to the measure and character of cooperation with Mexico in the Foot-and-Mouth Disease Program pursuant to section I of the Act of February 28, 1947 (21 U.S.C. 114b), the designation of members of advisory committees, and the appointment of Commissioners on any joint commission with the Government of Mexico set up under such Program.

e. Approval of requests for apportionment of reserves for emergency outbreaks of insect pests and plant diseases.

f. Determination of emergencies in connection with the eradication of foot-and-mouth disease and other contagious diseases of animals and poultry.

g. Designation of members of the Advisory Committee, under section 5 of the Humane Slaughter Act (Public Law 85-765).

2. *The following is reserved to the Judicial Officer.* a. Final action in proceedings pursuant to sections 7 and 8 of the Administrative Procedure Act, except orders in rulemaking proceedings under the Hog Cholera Serum and Virus Marketing Agreement Act.

III. *Assignment of responsibilities and authorities within ARS—A. Administrator—1. Responsibilities.* The Administrator is responsible for the programs and activities of ARS. The Administrator reports to the Assistant Secretary for Federal-States Relations.

2. *Authorities.* Subject to the reservations of authority contained in IIB above, the Administrator is authorized to execute any document, authorize any expenditure, and promulgate any rule, regulation, order or instruction required by law or deemed by him to be necessary and proper to the discharge of the functions assigned to the Agricultural Research Service, and to delegate and provide for the redelegation of his authority to appropriate officers and employees consistent with and with due regard to his personal responsibilities for the proper discharge of the functions assigned to the Service. The Associate Administrator is authorized to act for the Administrator in performing all functions for which the Administrator is responsible.

3. *Delegation of authorities.* There are hereby delegated to Deputy Administrators and Division Directors, and to those officers they designate to act for them, the authorities not specifically reserved herein which are necessary to the discharge of responsibilities assigned to the Agricultural Research Service. This delegation does not apply to authorities which are reserved by Administrative Regulation of the Department. No delegation herein shall preclude the Administrator from exercising any of the powers or functions, or from performing any of the duties herein, and any such delegation is subject at all times to withdrawal or amendment. Redelegations to others shall be made only with specific approval of the Administrator.

4. *Reservations.* There are hereby reserved to the Administrator or Acting Administrator the following authorities and/or responsibilities:

a. The initiation, change or discontinuance of major areas of research or regulatory and control activities conducted by ARS.

b. The issuance of regulations pursuant to law.

c. The transfer of functions, funds, property or personnel between divisions of ARS.

d. The approval of any change in the formal organization of ARS at the section, or equivalent level, and above.

e. Authority to establish, consolidate, change location, or abolish, or to recommend such action to the Department with respect to (1) any field office (except temporary offices), and (2) any regional or other administrative area that includes two or more States or that cuts across a State line.

f. All appointments and promotions to GS-14 and above, and all reassignments in GS-14 and above involving a basic change in the nature of the assignment.

g. Authorization and recommendation to the Department for approval of attendance at international and foreign meetings and foreign travel.

h. Approval of budget estimates.

i. Approval of work projects and recommendation of financial projects to the Department.

B. Responsibilities of divisions and staff offices reporting to the Administrator—1. Foreign Research and Technical Programs Division. Responsible for the foreign research contract and grant activities for the Department of Agriculture carried out by foreign governments and scientific organizations under Public Law 480 and related legislation with respect to functions assigned under IIA 16 and 17.

2. *Information Division.* Responsible for the overall information program for research and regulatory and control activities of ARS.

3. *Internal Audit Staff.* Responsible for the conduct of audits, inspections and reviews of ARS organizations and programs to assist the Administrator in maintaining effective and efficient administration of assignment and responsibilities.

4. *Emergency Programs Staff.* Responsible for developing and coordinating civil defense emergency programs concerning the protection of the Nation's crops, livestock and products thereof with respect to functions assigned under IIA 11.

5. *Legislation and Special Assignments Staff.* Responsible for advising and assisting the Administrator on matters relating to the ARS legislative programs, committee management and secretarial and congressional correspondence.

C. General responsibilities of Deputy Administrators and Division Directors. The Deputy Administrators and through them the Division Directors, have the following general responsibilities:

1. *Responsibility to the Administrator.* Keeping the Administrator advised with respect to major problems and develop-

ments and consulting with him, or in his absence, the Acting Administrator, before taking actions which involve policy questions or major questions involving relationships with other Federal agencies, other agencies of this Department or State agencies.

2. *Responsibility for coordination of policies and operations.* Consulting and cooperating with appropriate officials when their activities relate to, affect, or are affected by, the work of other organizational units of the Service, and assuring the coordination of such activities with such other organizational units in order to achieve maximum unity and effectiveness of ARS operations.

3. *Responsibility for efficient operation.* Assuring the efficient administration of work assigned to them and the fullest possible benefit to the public for the funds expended. To this end, they shall provide for the periodic review of programs and operations as required by Executive Order 10072 and 5 U.S.C. 1151.

D. *Specific responsibilities*—1. *Deputy Administrators.* Responsible for:

a. Assisting and acting for and as the Administrator in the overall planning and administration of all programs and activities of ARS.

b. Approval of line projects within their respective areas.

c. Directing and coordinating the overall program within their respective areas as indicated below.

2. *Deputy Administrator, Farm Research.* The following Farm Research Divisions and Staff offices report to the Deputy Administrator, Farm Research, and directly or in cooperation with Federal, State, public and private agencies as appropriate, plan, organize, provide leadership, coordinate and direct a national program of farm research with respect to functions assigned under IIA 2, 3, 5, and 14.

Agricultural Engineering Research Division.

Animal Disease and Parasite Research Division.

Animal Husbandry Research Division.

Crops Research Division.

Entomology Research Division.

Soil and Water Conservation Research Division.

Biometrical Services Staff.

Radiological Safety Staff.

3. *Deputy Administrator, Utilization Research and Development.* The following Utilization Research and Development Divisions and Staff office report to the Deputy Administrator, Utilization Research and Development, and directly or in cooperation with Federal, State, public and private agencies as appropriate, plan, organize, provide leadership, coordinate and direct a national program of research and development to provide new, wider and more effective uses for agricultural products and by-products with respect to functions assigned under IIA 2 and 3.

Eastern Utilization Research and Development Division.

Northern Utilization Research and Development Division.

Southern Utilization Research and Development Division.

Western Utilization Research and Development Division.

Product and Process Evaluation Staff.

4. *Deputy Administrator, Regulatory and Control.* The following Regulatory and Control Divisions report to the Deputy Administrator, Regulatory and Control, and directly or in cooperation with Federal, State, public and private agencies as appropriate, plan, organize, provide leadership, coordinate and direct a national program on regulatory and control functions and related functions with respect to functions assigned under IIA 3, 4, 6, 7, 10, 13, and 15.

Animal Disease Eradication Division.

Animal Inspection and Quarantine Division.

Meat Inspection Division.

Pesticides Regulation Division.

Plant Pest Control Division.

Plant Quarantine Division.

5. *Deputy Administrator, Research Planning and Coordination.* The Deputy Administrator, Research Planning and Coordination, has responsibility for reviewing and concurring in all line projects in the Department. The following Staff offices report to the Deputy Administrator, Research Planning and Coordination, and assist him in providing for the coordination of research activities of the Department and in providing special assistance to the Administrator in planning research programs with respect to functions assigned under IIA 1 and 8.

Research Advisory Committee Staff.

Central Project Office.

6. *Deputy Administrator, Nutrition and Consumer-Use Research.* The following Nutrition and Consumer-Use Research Divisions report to the Deputy Administrator, Nutrition and Consumer-Use Research and directly or in cooperation with Federal, State, public and private agencies as appropriate, plan, organize, provide leadership, coordinate and direct national programs of research with respect to functions assigned under IIA 2 and 3.

Clothing and Housing Research Division.

Consumer and Food Economics Research Division.

Human Nutrition Research Division.

7. *Deputy Administrator, Administrative Management.* The Deputy Administrator, Administrative Management, has Service-wide responsibility for administrative management, including policy formulation, program development and effectiveness of operations. The Deputy Administrator, Administrative Management, is also specifically responsible for:

a. Administrative functions on behalf of the Secretary of Agriculture relating to the acquisition and administration of patent rights.

b. The execution of cooperative agreements and Master Memoranda of Understanding; all agreements between ARS and another agency of the Department or with another agency of the Federal Government; and all agreements which would require signature by more than one Deputy Administrator.

c. Approval of attendance at national meetings.

d. Approval of restricted categories of purchases as required by Department regulations.

The following Administrative Management Divisions and offices report to the Deputy Administrator, Administrative Management, and are responsible for developing and recommending policies, programs, plans and procedures, and for providing technical and administrative direction and coordination in the execution, review and evaluation of approved policies and programs in their respective areas. The Director, Administrative Services Division, is responsible for the execution of domestic research contracts (including RMA contracts).

Administrative Services Division.

Budget and Finance Division.

Data Processing Division.

Management Research and Organization Division.

Personnel Division.

Regional Business Offices.

Agricultural Research Center Operations.

Done at Washington, D.C., this 31st day of May 1962.

B. T. SHAW,
Administrator,
Agricultural Research Service.

[F.R. Doc. 62-5492; Filed, June 5, 1962;
8:52 a.m.]

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Maritime Administration

CHIEF, OFFICE OF SHIP CONSTRUCTION

Delegation of Authority

Pursuant to the provisions of section 4.03 of Department of Commerce Order No. 117 (Revised), and the specific approval granted thereunder by the Secretary of Commerce under date of May 10, 1962, the Maritime Subsidy Board hereby delegates to the Chief, Office of Ship Construction authority to approve changes in contract plans and specifications of ships constructed, reconstructed, or reconditioned under contracts with the Maritime Subsidy Board, and authority to approve changes in cost and delay in delivery, if any, resulting from such changes provided such changes do not result in a cost change in excess of \$50,000 in any one instance and provided the aggregate cost of the changes does not increase the cost of the ship by more than 2 percent of the single vessel contract price. Actions taken under this authority shall be reported monthly to the Maritime Subsidy Board.

This delegation of authority is not to be construed as affecting the validity of any actions taken prior thereto by the Chief, Office of Ship Construction, which were in consonance with the provisions of section 8.02 of Department Order No. 117 (Revised).

Effective date: This delegation is effective as of May 10, 1962.

Dated: June 4, 1962.

DONALD W. ALEXANDER,
Chairman, Maritime Subsidy Board,
Maritime Administrator.

[F.R. Doc. 62-5496; Filed, June 5, 1962;
8:53 a.m.]

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

[Docket No. 13576]

NO-SHOW RULE

Notice of Prehearing Conference

In the matter of the no-show penalty exception of the Local Service Carriers et al.

Notice is hereby given that a prehearing conference on the above-entitled matter is assigned to be held on June 14, 1962 at 10 a.m., e.d.s.t., in Room 803, Universal Building, Connecticut and Florida Avenues NW., Washington, D.C., before Examiner William J. Madden.

Dated at Washington, D.C., May 31, 1962.

[SEAL]

FRANCIS W. BROWN,
Chief Examiner.

[F.R. Doc. 62-5472; Filed, June 5, 1962;
8:48 a.m.]

FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY

GENERAL AVIATION DISTRICT OFFICE AT SIOUX FALLS, SOUTH DAKOTA

Notice of Closing

Notice is hereby given that on June 1, 1962, the General Aviation District Office in Sioux Falls, South Dakota, will be closed.

(Sec. 313(a), 72 Stat. 752, 49 U.S.C. 1354)

Issued in Washington, D.C., on May 29, 1962.

N. E. HALABY,
Administrator.

[F.R. Doc. 62-5471; Filed, June 5, 1962;
8:48 a.m.]

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

[Docket No. 14320; FCC 62M-772]

CERACCHE & CO., INC.

Memorandum Opinion and Order Continuing Hearing

In re application of Ceracche & Company, Incorporated, Connecticut Hill, New York, Docket No. 14320, File No. 1676-C1-R-61; for renewal of the license for Station KEG51, a facility in the Domestic Public Point-to-Point Microwave Radio Service.

1. *Preliminary statement.* The Hearing Examiner has before him a petition for leave to amend and for continuance as well as a supplement thereto filed by Ceracche & Company, Incorporated (Ceracche) on May 17, 1962, and May 21, 1962, respectively. In essence, Ceracche asks leave to amend its original application herein to provide an additional point of communications to serve a customer with which the applicant allegedly has no identity of interest, ownership or otherwise either directly or indirectly and further seeks to have the procedural dates and the scheduled date for the start of the hearing specified

in the Examiner's order released March 9, 1962 (FCC 62M-352) continued without date.

2. *Background.* As originally filed, the application which is the subject of the hearing herein contemplated that communications service would be provided to a community antenna television system (CATV) which was owned or controlled by Ceracche. Upon consideration of this application, the Commission released its order of designation on October 30, 1961 (FCC 61-1242), wherein it stated that it was unable to find that a grant of the application would serve the public interest, convenience or necessity and, therefore, required a hearing on the specified issues. Two prehearing conferences were held herein on November 27 and January 29, respectively. After the second of such hearings, the Examiner by order released January 31, 1962 (FCC 62M-144) scheduled the hearing herein to commence on April 5, 1962. Thereafter, upon motion of Ceracche, a further prehearing conference was held and by the aforementioned order of the Examiner released March 9, 1962, the hearing was rescheduled for June 7, 1962.

3. *The instant pleading.* In the instant petition Ceracche alleges that it has, both prior to the designation of its application for hearing and at all times subsequent thereto, attempted actively to obtain additional independent customers; that these attempts culminated successfully only when it received a firm order for services on April 26, 1962; and that as quickly thereafter as possible the instant petition and appropriate amendment to its application were prepared. It is further alleged that there is no identity of interest or ownership between the applicant or any of its principals and the proposed new customer; that the new customer would be a "public subscriber" pursuant to the Commission's definition as set forth in its order of designation; and that a grant of the amended application by the Commission would provide grounds for the filing of a petition for reconsideration and grant without hearing thereby obviating the need for further hearing in the instant proceeding.

4. In its petition Ceracche calls attention to the fact that certain procedural dates have heretofore been specified by the Examiner in the aforementioned order released on March 9, 1962, and the hearing itself is presently scheduled to commence on June 7, 1962. It requests that the procedural dates and hearing date be continued until such time as the Commission may have acted on its application for amendment and its proposed petition for reconsideration and grant without hearing.

5. On the basis of all of the foregoing, it is argued that Ceracche has at all times acted with due diligence and good faith and has shown good cause why its petition should be granted. Ceracche further requests that, in view of the aforementioned time schedule now fixed, the provisions of the Commission's rules (47 CFR 1.43) relating to deferral action for a four-day period be waived. Finally, it is alleged that the Common Carrier Bu-

reau, the only other party to this proceeding, has no objection to a grant of the relief requested herein nor to a waiver of the aforementioned four-day rule.

6. *Discussion.* The basic question to be determined by the Examiner at this stage of the proceeding is whether Ceracche has shown good cause for a grant of its petition filed approximately seven months after the matter was designated for hearing. In this connection, it is to be noted first, that the applicant has been attempting to consummate the agreement which is the subject of the amendment to its application even before the order of designation was issued. The delay in filing the instant petition apparently results from the fact that it had been unable to find the customer it was seeking and to consummate the agreement with such customer until the latter part of April of this year. Secondly, it appears that this entire matter has been set for hearing solely because the applicant was unable to secure the requisite percentage of customers who are not affiliated with it. The Examiner is aware that the Commission made a suggestion in its public notice of October 25, 1961. (Mimeo No. 11683) that if licensees in this service wished to avoid a formal hearing they could, among other things, make efforts to obtain customers for the services of these point-to-point microwave facilities which are not in any way related to our other common control with the licensee. The Examiner is further aware that in a Memorandum Opinion and Order In re Application of Western Television Relay, Inc., Docket No. 14317, released May 8, 1962 (FCC 62-472), the Commission in a situation which appears to be similar to that which would obtain herein if the amendment were to be accepted, renewed the license of an applicant and terminated the proceeding. Finally, it is noted that the only other party hereto, the Commission's Common Carrier Bureau, interposes no objection to a grant of the petition. Under all of these circumstances, it would appear to the Examiner that the requisite good cause has been shown for a prompt grant of both the petition and the request for a continuance without date.

7. The proposed amendment does, however, present several other problems which should be disposed of herein. First of all, at the prehearing conference held on January 29, 1962, the Examiner's attention was called to the fact that, when an amendment of the type herein involved is tendered for filing, the Commission's Common Carrier Bureau normally assigns a file number to it. The Commission's rules specifically provide, however (47 CFR 21.20(c)), that the assignment of a file number of such applications is for the administrative convenience of the Commission and does not indicate the acceptance of the applications for filing and processing. Secondly, it appears that under the requirements of statute (47 USC 309(b) (A)) and the Commission's rules (47 CFR 21.27 and 21.33), certain types of amendments require that a specified period elapse after public notice is given of

their filing before definitive action thereon may be taken. Accordingly, the action of the Hearing Examiner herein in granting the Petition for Leave to Amend is to be construed only as authorization for the tendering of the application for filing without in any way passing upon the technical acceptability thereof. Furthermore, it is in no way intended to, and in fact cannot, toll the applicable public notice periods provided for by the statute and the rules. Finally, it is clear that the petition for reconsideration referred to by Ceracche cannot be filed until after full compliance with the aforementioned statutory and regulatory provisions has been achieved and the grant of the petition herein is so conditioned.

Accordingly, it is ordered, This 29th day of May 1962, that the Petition for Leave to Amend is granted subject to the requirements of 47 CFR 21.20(c) with respect to defective applications and the provisions of 47 CFR 21.27 and 21.33 with respect to public notice; and

It is further ordered, That the procedural dates heretofore specified by the Examiner are cancelled and that the hearing heretofore scheduled to commence on June 7, 1962, is continued until further order of the Examiner pending action by the Commission on the amendment authorized hereby and on a petition for reconsideration and grant without hearing to be filed: *Provided, however,* That any party to the proceeding may for good cause shown file a motion requesting that the hearing be held on a date certain.

Released: May 31, 1962.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS
COMMISSION,

[SEAL] BEN F. WAPLE,
Acting Secretary.

[F.R. Doc. 62-5475; Filed, June 5, 1962;
8:49 a.m.]

[Docket No. 14579; FCC 62M-776]

WARREN J. CURRENCE

Order Continuing Hearing

In the matter of Warren J. Currence, Elkins, West Virginia, Docket No. 14579; order to show cause why there should not be revoked the License for Radio Station 4W0152 in the Citizens Radio Service.

The Hearing Examiner having under consideration the informal request of counsel for the applicant, Warren J. Currence, communicated through Commission counsel, for a continuance of the hearing date presently scheduled herein, and the informal concurrence of Commission counsel in such request;

It is ordered, This 29th day of May 1962, that the hearing herein heretofore scheduled to commence on June 6, 1962, is continued to June 21, 1962, in Elkins, West Virginia.

Released: May 31, 1962.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS
COMMISSION,

[SEAL] BEN F. WAPLE,
Acting Secretary.

[F.R. Doc. 62-5476; Filed, June 5, 1962;
8:49 a.m.]

[Docket Nos. 14552-14556; FCC 62M-774]

LARAMIE COMMUNITY TV CO. ET AL.

Order Scheduling Prehearing Conference

In re applications of Laramie Community TV Company, Division of Collier Community TV Company, Inc., Laramie, Wyoming, et al., Docket Nos. 14552, 14553, 14554, File Nos. BPTTV-78, BPTTV-79, VPTTV-80; Albany Electronics, Inc., Laramie, Wyoming, Docket Nos. 14555, 14556, File Nos. BPTTV-539, BPTTV-540; for construction permits for VHF Translator Stations.

The Hearing Examiner having under consideration his Order Following Prehearing Conference (FCC 62M-673) released May 11, 1962, wherein the parties were required to confer among and between themselves regarding the nature of the evidence to be presented in response to certain issues specified in the order of designation herein, released March 5, 1962 (FCC 62-250), in an attempt to arrive at appropriate stipulations with respect thereto and, further, to consult regarding their respective desires that other parties produce data and material from their files, all in an attempt to arrive at agreements with respect to these matters, and wherein the parties were further required to advise the Examiner no later than May 28, 1962, whether they have reached such stipulations and agreements and, if not, the nature and extent of the disagreements which exist;

It appearing, that the Examiner has been informally advised by counsel for two of the parties that they have not been able to arrive at the aforementioned stipulations and agreements;

It further appearing, that in the aforementioned order following prehearing conference the Examiner indicated that, upon failure of the parties to arrive at such stipulations or agreements they should be prepared to attend a further prehearing conference on June 7 to make such formal requests of the Examiner as they may desire regarding these matters;

It is ordered, This 29th day of May 1962, that a further prehearing conference with respect to the matters hereinabove specified and such other matters as the parties may properly desire to raise shall be held at the Offices of the Commission in Washington, D.C., beginning at 9:00 a.m., on June 7, 1962.

Released: May 31, 1962.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS
COMMISSION,

[SEAL] BEN F. WAPLE,
Acting Secretary.

[F.R. Doc. 62-5477; Filed, June 5, 1962;
8:49 a.m.]

[Docket No. 14330; FCC 62M-773]

NEW YORK PENN MICROWAVE CORP.

Order Continuing Hearing

In re application of New York Penn Microwave Corporation, Canisteo, New

York, Docket No. 14330, File No. 2590-C1-R-61; for renewal of the license for Station KEG41, a facility in the Domestic Public Point-to-Point Microwave Radio Service.

The Hearing Examiner having under consideration a Petition for Leave to Amend and for continuance as well as a supplement thereto filed by New York Penn Microwave Corporation (New York Penn) on May 17, 1962, and May 21, 1962, respectively, wherein New York Penn asks leave to amend its original application to provide an additional point of communication to serve a customer with which the applicant allegedly has no identity of interest, ownership or otherwise, directly or indirectly, and wherein New York Penn further seeks to have the procedural dates and the scheduled date for the start of the hearing specified in the Examiner's order released on March 9, 1962 (FCC 62M-353), continued without date;

It appearing, that the Examiner has this date issued a Memorandum Opinion and Order In re Application of Ceracche & Company, Incorporated, Docket No. 14320, wherein he considered a substantially identical pleading filed on behalf of that company by the counsel who also represents New York Penn;

It further appearing, that except for the scheduled date for the start of the hearing herein, the background, the arguments of counsel in behalf of a grant and the considerations upon which the Examiner determined to make the grant as conditioned, set forth in the aforementioned Memorandum Opinion, paragraphs 2 through 7, are fully applicable to the instant matter and are incorporated herein as if set forth fully herein;

It further appearing, in view of the foregoing that good cause has been shown for a prompt grant of both the petition and the request for continuance without date;

It is ordered, This 29th day of May 1962, that the Petition for Leave to Amend is granted subject to the requirements of 47 CFR 21.20(c) with respect to defective applications, and the provisions of 47 CFR 21.27 and 21.33 with respect to public notice; and

It is further ordered, That the procedural dates heretofore specified by the Examiner are cancelled and that the hearing heretofore scheduled to commence on June 11, 1962, is continued until further order of the Examiner pending action by the Commission on the amendment authorized hereby and on a petition for reconsideration and grant without hearing to be filed: *Provided, however,* That any party to the proceeding may for good cause shown file a motion requesting that the hearing be held on a date certain.

Released: May 31, 1962.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS
COMMISSION,

[SEAL] BEN F. WAPLE,
Acting Secretary.

[F.R. Doc. 62-5478; Filed, June 5, 1962;
8:49 a.m.]

[Docket No. 14650; FCC 62-533]

DOMESTIC TELEGRAPH SERVICE**Memorandum Opinion and Order
Instituting Investigation**

1. *Preliminary statement.* In recent years there have been far-reaching developments in the art of domestic telecommunications. These developments have given rise to new methods of communication and new services to supply the growing demands of industry and government. The domestic communication carriers have been affected by these developments in varying degrees. Substantial changes have been experienced in the demand for long-established services, particularly, the message telegraph services. It appears to the Commission that the pace and tempo of the above-described developments are accelerating and that even greater changes may be expected in the next several years. Accordingly, the Commission feels that it should be more fully advised on a current basis regarding potential developments as well as the effects that they may have upon the availability to the public of rapid, efficient, nationwide message telegraph and other communication services with adequate facilities at reasonable charges.

2. *Background.* For all practical purposes, the landline system of The Western Union Telegraph Company (Western Union) is the domestic message telegraph industry in the continental United States excluding Alaska, although there are some 40 small telephone, railroad, and telegraph companies, with which Western Union connects, rendering message telegraph service. In addition to providing service between points in the continental United States,¹ Western Union through its connections in Mexico and Canada provides service between Canada and Mexico and between the United States and these countries. Western Union is the sole agency for the landline handling of overseas and ship-shore messages originating or terminating in the continental United States outside of the so-called gateway cities. Western Union also furnishes private line and other communication services, such as telegraphic money orders.

3. In its Supplemental Application for Merger of The Western Union Telegraph Company and Postal Telegraph, Inc., in Docket No. 6517, Western Union represented that a grant of its application would serve the public interest by facilitating improvements and economies in telegraph service. Following public hearings, the application was granted on September 27, 1943, and the implementation of the merger was substantially completed during 1945. During the period 1945-1960, however, the volume of telegraph messages handled by Western Union declined 47 percent, from 245 million messages to 131 million messages a year; the number of public telegraph offices in the United States declined about 37 percent, from 29,687 to 18,849

offices, and message telegraph rates, in the aggregate, have about doubled. The company's message volume continues to decline and applications for authority to close telegraph offices or to reduce their hours of service continue to be filed with the Commission. Western Union attributes this decline in message business largely to:

(a) Telephone competition—as the number of telephone installations increased following the war, social telegraphing diminished;

(b) TWX expansion, which cut heavily into Western Union's business telegraphing;

(c) Diversion of message traffic to private wire services of both Western Union and the Bell System;

(d) Improved and expanded air mail service which adversely affected Western Union's deferred overnight message traffic; and

(e) Shrinkage effect of increased prices for message telegraph services comprised of rate increases required to offset wage increases and a continuation of the Federal excise tax on telegrams.

4. In contrast to the declining message business, private line telegraph and teletypewriter exchange type services are growing. Annual private line telegraph revenue of Western Union increased from \$6 million in 1945 to \$57 million in 1960. During the same period the Bell System's private line telegraph revenue increased from \$24 million to \$116 million a year and its annual teletypewriter exchange service (TWX) revenue from \$17 million to \$63 million. Telex, Western Union's service which is directly competitive with TWX, was first offered in 1958. Considerable expansion of Telex service is planned but, at present, it produces limited revenue for Western Union. During 1945-1960, Western Union's share of total domestic telegraph communications revenues declined from 80.7 percent to 58.0 percent, while Bell's share increased from 19.3 percent to 42.0 percent.

5. In March 1943, the Domestic Merger Act (section 222 of the Communications Act), 57 Stat. 5, was enacted. In addition to providing for the merger or consolidation of any two or more domestic telegraph carriers, the Act also made provision "for any domestic telegraph carrier, as a part of any such consolidation or merger or thereafter, to acquire all or any part of the domestic telegraph properties, domestic telegraph facilities, or domestic telegraph operations of any carrier which is not primarily a telegraph carrier." However, Western Union has been unable to reach agreement with the Bell System for the acquisition of its TWX service.

6. On June 22, 1953, the Subcommittee on a Communications Study of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee issued a Report of the Subcommittee (Senate Document No. 53, 83d Congress—1st Session) dealing with the problems confronting the domestic telegraph industry. The Subcommittee's report concludes, in part, as follows:

Your subcommittee believes that attention must be given to three alternatives. The adoption of one or more of these would in varying degrees either alleviate the present problems of the domestic telegraph company, or place the company in a sound position to render an effective telegraph service, or insure the operation of an effective nationwide telegraph service. These alternatives, the last of which your subcommittee feels is the only one acceptable in the public interest, are:

1. Authorize the Western Union Co. to drastically reduce its nationwide service to a smaller, special-class operation serving from 25 to 125 large key cities, thus handling only the large-volume, more profitable, traffic. There is, of course, no positive assurance that Western Union could survive as a financially sound enterprise under such a curtailed plan of operation, but an analysis of costs and revenues on such a projection indicates it would be profitable. Operation of domestic telegraph service under such a policy would deny record message service to thousands of towns and villages as well as medium-sized cities, and result, of course, in serious unemployment to telegraph employees by probable reductions from 10 to 30 percent or more in the present force of nearly 42,000 employees.

2. Permit or require the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. (The Bell System) to take over the domestic telegraph operations of the Western Union Co. This would provide telegraph service (much of it relayed by telephone) throughout the United States, although the extension of the dial system has eliminated hundreds of small-town central offices and great difficulty would be experienced in furnishing a personal service to some telegraph users. It should be emphasized that the Bell System has expressed no interest in taking over telegraph operations and there are serious legal questions as to whether it could legislatively be required to do so, or whether it would do so, if legislatively permitted to acquire these telegraph operations. Moreover, it is logical to assume that the telephone company would not want to take over any telegraph services which are not lucrative and which do not fit into its pattern of operations. Acquisition of the domestic telegraph business by the telephone company might be expected to bring about a major diminution in the total labor force now employed by the Western Union since many telegraph operations undoubtedly would be integrated into existing telephone service. One definite result would be a complete monopoly in one company, bereft of all competition, of all methods of electric communications, both record and voice, within the United States.

3. Acquisition by the Western Union Co. of the private line telegraph service and the teletypewriter exchange service now operated by the American Telephone & Telegraph Co., such services to be operated at rates approved by the Federal Communications Commission. Such acquisition, which would carry out the congressional intent as outlined in Senate Report 769, would depend upon the reaching of an agreement on a price fair to both seller and buyer, and the ability of the buyer to obtain the necessary funds to make the purchase.

These alternatives sharply point up the problem that faces the citizens of this country today with respect to the domestic telegraph business. Your subcommittee has in the past and is now reluctant to recommend mandatory measures but is of the opinion that the conclusions reached by your subcommittee in its Report No. 769 of the 76th Congress set forth above are sound and correct. It is even more evident today that the acquisition of the teletypewriter and leased wire services from the telephone companies would strengthen and stabilize the financial structure and competitive position of the

¹ By connection with the Alaska Communications System of the United States Army at Seattle, Washington, Western Union renders service to and from Alaska.

telegraph system. However, it goes without question that the sounder the financial position and the more effective the competitive position of the Nation's telegraph system, the greater the benefits in the public interest. Therefore, your subcommittee commends the respective companies for their efforts to settle this problem through negotiations and is hopeful that such negotiations will soon be successfully consummated.

Following an offer by Western Union in October 1953, subsequent to the Subcommittee Report, to purchase the TWX service and the private line teletype-writer and morse service of the telephone companies, the American Telephone and Telegraph Company has advised Western Union that it does not desire to dispose of any of its telegraph services.

7. *Current status.* Notwithstanding the substantial decline in the message business described above, as of December 31, 1960, Western Union's landline system comprised a gross investment in plant of \$398 million (\$229 million after allowance for depreciation); it had 18,849 telegraph offices in the United States, of which 2,005 were company-operated offices and the remainder were agency offices operated by railroads, small telephone companies, and miscellaneous small businesses; and it employed 32,643 people including 5,280 messengers but excluding telegraph agencies and their employees. During 1960, the company had landline revenue of \$262 million including \$190 million for message telegraph services, more than \$56.5 million for private wire services and \$8.7 million from money order premium charges. During the same period, Western Union handled about 131 million messages, including the landline handling of almost 11 million overseas and ship-shore messages. Current landline earnings of about \$10 million a year are approximately 4 percent of the company's net investment in its landline system. Thus, there is a sizeable demand for message telegraph service in the United States and substantial resources are employed in its rendition. However, it seems clear that a continuation of the decline in message volume and the consequent reduction in the number of public telegraph offices raise a serious question as to the continued availability to the public of a nationwide message telegraph service.

8. About a year ago, the President of Western Union reviewed with the Commission certain factors affecting the telegraph company's ability to maintain a high quality of message service. Western Union stated that the Bell System's activities in the telegraph field have been the most critical external factor affecting the telegraph company's operations since the merger with Postal Telegraph in 1943. Western Union alleged "loss-leader" price cutting and "cream skimming" of record communications by the telephone company as illustrated by returns of less than 2 percent on Bell's TWX and Private Line Telegraph Services prior to 1953 and 1958, respectively, in contrast with a return of more than 10 percent on its noncompetitive Private Line Telephone Service before the private line telephone rates were reduced in

1958 at the Commission's order. The preservation of a nationwide public telegraph system, urged Western Union, requires the adoption of five basic policy suggestions as follows:

(1) Requirement that all private wire telegraph services, including TELPAK and multiple channel services, stand on their own full-cost rate bases and that rates for these services be fully compensatory.

(2) Positive support by the Commission of Western Union efforts to acquire TWX as being directly competitive with telegraphic message services; and requirement, meanwhile, that TWX stand on its own full-cost rate base and that rates for this service be fully compensatory.

(3) Requirement of industry-wide interconnection among common carriers for voice, alternate record-voice, TV and other telecommunications services, as well as for telegraph services.

(4) That the Commission reconsider or at least limit the future effectuation of the private microwave decision.

(5) That the Commission maintain, on a continuing basis, surveillance of the record activities of telephone companies, for the purpose of ensuring continuance of equitable competitive conditions in the communications industry once they have been established.

9. The rates and regulations applicable to the private wire services, including TELPAK and multiple channel services, are subjects of formal proceedings before the Commission in which Western Union is a party. By Memorandum Opinion and Order dated September 28, 1960, the Commission reconsidered its Report and Order of August 6, 1959, in the Matter of Allocation of Frequencies in the Bands above 890 Mc., Docket No. 11866 (29 F.C.C. 825) dealing, among other things, with the licensing of private microwave communication systems. As we stated at that time, we propose to keep constant watch over the development of private services and the impact of such services upon the operations of the communication carriers.

10. From the foregoing, it appears to the Commission that:

(a) Although message service has declined in volume, and relative importance, there is still a definite need for the continuation and improvement of this service to a substantial segment of the community and the public interest requires that effective measures be taken to meet the needs of this segment of the public;

(b) Western Union faces serious problems which could very well affect its ability to provide the requisite standard of service to an important segment of the using public;

(c) As the responsible government agency in this field, the Commission should investigate this matter and take such steps as appear to it to be most appropriate and feasible to assure continuation and improvement of essential telecommunications services in the domestic field;

(d) At the present time, the Commission does not have available sufficient information upon which to base either recommendations or action;

(e) That the necessary information can best be secured through a formal investigation; and

(f) That the Telephone and Telegraph Committees of the Commission are best equipped to conduct such an investigation on behalf of the Commission and to prepare a report summarizing the findings made and recommending the action which it is believed to be both appropriate and necessary.

1. *Accordingly, it is ordered,* That, pursuant to sections 4(i), 215(b), 218, 219(b) and 403 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, an investigation be, and it is hereby instituted, on the Commission's own motion, regarding domestic telegraph operations and services within the United States;

2. *It is further ordered,* That, without in any way limiting the scope of the investigation, it shall include inquiry into the following specific matters:

(a) The extent to which Western Union's domestic message telegraph services are required to meet the public needs for communications services and for the purpose of the national defense;

(b) The scope and extent of the various domestic telegraph services of Western Union and the Bell System, the facilities employed in the rendition of each such service, the profitability of each service, and the plans of each of these entities with respect to each service as well as any other services they may plan to offer in the future;

(c) The operating practices of Western Union, the efficiency thereof, and the manner in which increased efficiency could be achieved;

(d) The speed and reliability of Western Union's domestic message telegraph service and the manner in which such speed and reliability can be improved;

(e) The extent to which Western Union provides a comprehensive nationwide system for domestic message telegraph and other communication services, investigations made and standards and policies followed by Western Union in planning extensions and curtailments of its services and the geographic scope of such services which Western Union should provide in order to meet public requirements for domestic telegraph services;

(f) Western Union's plans and programs for expanding and improving its services and reducing the costs thereof, the progress heretofore made in carrying out Western Union's mechanization and expansion programs, its schedule for completing such programs, and the specific benefits to Western Union and to the public likely to result from such programs;

(g) The relationship between expected volume of service and Western Union's plant capacity and whether Western Union will have sufficient volumes of business to make efficient and economic use of its proposed expanded plant capacity;

(h) The ability of Western Union, with expansion of facilities and reduction of rates, to handle greater volumes of communications services at a profit;

(i) The basis upon which Western Union formulates its policies with respect to developing its domestic communications services, the degree to which it makes or employs statistical, economic,

and other studies or investigations to determine public requirements for or public reaction to the services offered or proposed to be offered by it, and the nature, extent, and reliability of such studies;

(j) Western Union's patent structure and patent agreements, and the degree to which Western Union avails itself of technical developments and improvements in telecommunications or may be barred from the use of such improvements by patent restrictions imposed by others;

(k) The status of Western Union's contracts and arrangements with telephone carriers, the extent and nature of reliance on the facilities of telephone carriers for the conduct of its operations, its future plans with respect to such matters, and the differences between the terms and conditions under which facilities of telephone carriers are furnished Western Union for the conduct of its operations and the terms and conditions under which such facilities are furnished to members of the public for the conduct of their business;

(l) The extent and area of competition between Western Union's communications services, on the one hand, and the telegraph, other record and telephone services of the Bell System and the air mail services, on the other hand; the ability of Western Union to meet such competition; and the plans made and the action taken by it to do so;

(m) Western Union's capital position and financial status and prospects of its ability to continue operation on a sound financial basis;

(n) The steps which should be taken to improve Western Union operations and strengthen its financial position so that it can provide the people of the United States with rapid, efficient domestic message telegraph services on a comprehensive nation-wide basis with adequate facilities at reasonable charges, and for purposes of the national defense;

(o) Whether such steps to be taken in the public interest should include the divestment by the Bell System of its teletypewriter exchange or other telegraph services and their acquisition by Western Union;

(p) In the event it should appear that Western Union for financial or other reasons should be or become unable to provide service to meet the standards described in subparagraph (n) above:

i. Whether the telephone companies in the United States should be required to provide such services;

ii. Whether governmental assistance or intervention in any form will be necessary or should be recommended to assure a comprehensive nationwide domestic telegraph communications service;

iii. What other steps should be taken to assure such service and if so the nature, extent and scope of such steps; and

iv. Whether something less than a comprehensive nationwide domestic message telegraph service would be in the public interest and, if so, the nature, extent and scope of such service, and the steps to be taken to assure the ability of Western Union to provide it.

3. *It is further ordered*, That The Western Union Telegraph Company and the American Telephone & Telegraph Company be and they are hereby made parties respondent herein, and that copies of this Memorandum Opinion and Order shall be sent to the respondents;

4. *It is further ordered*, That copies of this Memorandum Opinion and Order be sent to the Governor of each state, the United States Independent Telephone Association, The Commercial Telegraphers' Union, the American Communications Association, the United States Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of Manufacturers, the American Newspaper Publishers Association, the National Association of Railroad and Utilities Commissioners, the Administrator of General Services, the Postmaster General, and the Secretary of Defense, all of whom are invited to submit such facts and comments as they may have for the consideration of the Commission in this matter;

5. *It is further ordered*, That the hearings in this proceeding shall be held before the Telephone and Telegraph Committees of the Commission, or before a hearing examiner whom they may designate to act for them with respect to certain or all of such hearings, at such times and at such places as may hereafter be fixed by such committees, or by such hearing examiner acting under authority of such committees;

6. *It is further ordered*, That the Telephone and Telegraph Committees of the Commission shall proceed promptly with the investigation and shall, at the close thereof, issue a Report embodying such recommendations as appear appropriate and necessary in light of the information and other data adduced with respect to each of the matters herein above specified.

Adopted: May 23, 1962.

Released: May 25, 1962.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS
COMMISSION,

[SEAL] BEN F. WAPLE,
Acting Secretary.

[F.R. Doc. 62-5483; Filed, June 5, 1962;
8:51 a.m.]

FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION

AMERICAN PRESIDENT LINES ET AL.

Notice of Agreement Filed for Approval

Notice is hereby given that the following described agreement has been filed with the Commission for approval pursuant to section 15 of the Shipping Act, 1916 (39 Stat. 733, 75 Stat. 763; 46 U.S.C. 814):

Agreement 8485-B, between American President Lines, Ltd., Pacific Far East Line, Inc. and American Mail Line, Ltd., is a supplemental agreement to approved Agreement 8485, between the same parties, which covers an arrangement for the appointment of a coordinating committee of representatives of each of these companies to prepare studies and make

recommendations for further cooperation between said companies in order to effect economies and more efficient operations in their trans-Pacific service. Agreement 8485-B, covers an arrangement for the joint cooperation on insurance matters by American President Lines and Pacific Far East Line, to which American Mail Line consents to its execution but advised that it will not participate therein.

Interested parties may inspect this agreement and obtain copies thereof at the Bureau of Foreign Regulation, Federal Maritime Commission, Washington, D.C., and may submit within 20 days after publication of this notice in the FEDERAL REGISTER, written statements with reference to the agreement and their position as to approval, disapproval, or modification, together with request for hearing should such hearing be desired.

Dated: June 1, 1962.

By order of the Federal Maritime Commission.

THOMAS LIST,
Secretary.

[F.R. Doc. 62-5485; Filed, June 5, 1962;
8:51 a.m.]

ATLANTIC PASSENGER STEAMSHIP CONFERENCE AND TRANS-ATLANTIC PASSENGER STEAMSHIP CONFERENCE

Notice of Agreements Filed for Approval

Notice is hereby given that the following described agreements have been filed with the Commission for approval pursuant to section 15 of the Shipping Act, 1916 (39 Stat. 733, 75 Stat. 763; 46 U.S.C. 814):

Agreement 7840-49, between the member lines of the Atlantic Passenger Steamship Conference, modifies the basic agreement of that Conference (No. 7840), which governs all trans-Atlantic passenger traffic between European, Mediterranean, Black Sea, Moroccan, Madeiran and Azorian ports and ports of the East Coast of North America (including Gulf ports, Canada and Newfoundland). The purpose of this modification is to add a commentary to Provision 7 of Annex 1 of the conference agreement extending the application of the present free passage facility available to party organizers to provide one free round trip passage to a bona fide party conductor for every party of 25 or more adult passengers sailing round trip at round trip party fares in low season.

Agreement 120-77, between the member lines of the Trans-Atlantic Passenger Steamship Conference, modifies the approved agreement of that Conference (120, as amended), which covers an arrangement for the coordination and regulation of all actions and matters, other than the fixing of fares and commissions, relating to the operation and enforcement in the United States and Canada of the Atlantic Passenger Steamship Conference (Agreement 7840, as amended) the scope of which is set forth

in the above paragraph under Agreement 7840-49. The purpose of the modification is to expand the scope of Conference Agreement 120, as amended, to include ports on the St. Lawrence River and Great Lakes.

Interested parties may inspect these agreements and obtain copies thereof at the Bureau of Foreign Regulation, Federal Maritime Commission, Washington, D.C., and may submit within 10 days after publication of this notice in the FEDERAL REGISTER, written statements with reference to either of these agreements and their position as to approval, disapproval, or modification, together with request for hearing should such hearing be desired.

Dated: June 1, 1962.

By order of the Federal Maritime Commission.

THOMAS LISI,
Secretary.

[F.R. Doc. 62-5486; Filed, June 5, 1962;
8:51 a.m.]

[Docket No. 1010]

CANAL, CENTRAL AMERICA NORTH- BOUND CONFERENCE

Amended Notice of Filing of Exclusive Patronage (Dual Rate) Contracts

The first paragraph of notice in Docket 1010, which appeared in the FEDERAL REGISTER of May 29, 1962, page number 5010, is hereby amended to read as follows:

Notice is hereby given that the Canal, Central America Northbound Conference has filed with the Commission, pursuant to section 3 of Public Law 87-346, proposed Exclusive Patronage (Dual Rate) Contracts, modified for the purpose of conforming such contracts to the provisions of section 14b of the Shipping Act, 1916. As required by section 3, the Federal Maritime Commission will determine whether the contracts should be approved, disapproved, canceled or modified pursuant to the provisions of section 14b. One contract applies only to "Shippers" (Shippers Rate Agreement) and the other only to "Receivers" (Receivers Rate Agreement).

Dated: June 1, 1962.

THOMAS LISI,
Secretary.

[F.R. Doc. 62-5487; Filed, June 5, 1962;
8:52 a.m.]

[Docket No. 1035]

PACIFIC COAST/CARIBBEAN SEA PORTS CONFERENCE

Amended Notice of Filing of Exclusive Patronage (Dual Rate) Contracts

The first paragraph of notice in Docket 1035, which appeared in the FEDERAL REGISTER of May 30, 1962, page number 5105, is hereby amended to read as follows:

Notice is hereby given that the Pacific Coast/Caribbean Sea Ports Conference has filed with the Commission, pursuant to Section 3 of Public Law 87-346, pro-

posed Exclusive Patronage (Dual Rate) Contracts, modified for the purpose of conforming such contracts to the provisions of section 14b of the Shipping Act, 1916. As required by section 3, the Federal Maritime Commission will determine whether the contracts should be approved, disapproved, canceled or modified pursuant to the provisions of section 14b. One contract applies only to Cuba, and the other contract only to the other trade areas covered by the conference.

Dated: June 1, 1962.

THOMAS LISI,
Secretary.

[F.R. Doc. 62-5488; Filed, June 5, 1962;
8:52 a.m.]

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

[Docket No. CP62-222]

MICHIGAN WISCONSIN PIPE LINE CO.

Notice of Application and Date of Hearing

MAY 29, 1962.

Take notice that on March 26, 1962, Michigan Wisconsin Pipe Line Company (Applicant), 645 Griswold Street, Detroit 26, Michigan, filed in Docket No. CP62-222, an application pursuant to section 7(c) of the Natural Gas Act for a certificate of public convenience and necessity authorizing the construction during the 12-month period commencing June 19, 1962, and the operation of field facilities to enable Applicant to take into its certificated main pipeline system natural gas which will be purchased from producers thereof, all as more fully set forth in the application which is on file with the Commission and open to public inspection.

The purpose of this "budget-type" application is to augment Applicant's ability to act with reasonable dispatch in contracting for and connecting to its pipeline system new supplies of natural gas in various producing areas generally co-extensive with said system.

The total cost of the proposed facilities will not exceed \$3,000,000, and no single project will exceed a cost of \$500,000. The application states that the proposed facilities will be financed from funds on hand.

This matter is one that should be disposed of as promptly as possible under the applicable rules and regulations and to that end:

Take further notice that, pursuant to the authority contained in and subject to the jurisdiction conferred upon the Federal Power Commission by sections 7 and 15 of the Natural Gas Act, and the Commission's rules of practice and procedure, a hearing will be held on July 3, 1962, at 9:30 a.m., e.d.s.t., in a Hearing Room of the Federal Power Commission, 441 G Street NW., Washington, D.C., concerning the matters involved in and the issues presented by such application: *Provided, however*, That the Commission may, after a non-contested hearing, dispose of the proceedings pursuant to the provisions of section 1.30(c) (1) or (2) of the Com-

mission's rules of practice and procedure. Under the procedure herein provided for, unless otherwise advised, it will be unnecessary for Applicant to appear or be represented at the hearing.

Protests or petitions to intervene may be filed with the Federal Power Commission, Washington 25, D.C., in accordance with the rules of practice and procedure (18 CFR 1.8 or 1.10) on or before June 22, 1962. Failure of any party to appear at and participate in the hearing shall be construed as waiver of and concurrence in omission herein of the intermediate decision procedure in cases where a request therefor is made.

GORDON M. GRANT,
Acting Secretary.

[F.R. Doc. 62-5451; Filed, June 5, 1962;
8:45 a.m.]

[Docket No. CP62-203]

UNITED GAS PIPE LINE CO.

Notice of Application and Date of Hearing

MAY 29, 1962.

Take notice that on February 28, 1962, United Gas Pipe Line Company (Applicant), 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, Louisiana, filed in Docket No. CP62-203 an application pursuant to section 7(c) of the Natural Gas Act for a certificate of public convenience and necessity authorizing the construction and operation of approximately 18.37 miles of pipeline, looping four existing lateral pipelines in Mississippi in order to sell and deliver additional volumes of natural gas to United Gas Corporation (United Gas) for resale in order to meet the increased requirements of towns now being served by the latter in Northwest Mississippi, all as more fully set forth in the application on file with the Commission and open to public inspection.

Applicant proposes to construct and operate:

(a) approximately 2.7 miles of 4-inch pipeline loop on Applicant's Charleston-Crowder Lateral, Tallahatchie County, Mississippi;

(b) approximately 2.83 miles of 4-inch pipeline loop on Applicant's Lamber-Marks Lateral, Quitman County, Mississippi;

(c) approximately 5 miles of 6-inch pipeline loop on Applicant's Oxford-Water Valley Lateral, Lafayette County, Mississippi; and

(d) approximately 7.79 miles of 4-inch pipeline loop on Applicant's Senatobia-Como Lateral, Tate County, Mississippi.

Applicant indicates that it relies on the purchase of additional gas supplies from Tennessee Gas Transmission Company (Tennessee) in order to render the proposed increased service.

Applicant states that the construction of the proposed facilities will not be commenced until (1) Tennessee has been authorized by the Commission to sell and deliver additional firm quantities of natural gas to Applicant and Tennessee has accepted such authorization, and (2) Tennessee has prepared and entered into new service agreements with Applicant providing for such additional quantities of firm natural gas.

The application shows that the cost of the proposed facilities is estimated to be \$428,600, which cost will be financed from current working funds.

This matter is one that should be disposed of as promptly as possible under the applicable rules and regulations and to that end:

Take further notice that, pursuant to the authority contained in and subject to the jurisdiction conferred upon the Federal Power Commission by sections 7 and 15 of the Natural Gas Act, and the Commission's rules of practice and procedure, a hearing will be held on July 3, 1962, at 9:30 a.m., e.d.s.t., in a Hearing Room of the Federal Power Commission, 441 G Street NW., Washington, D.C., concerning the matters involved in and the issues presented by such application: *Provided, however,* That the Commission may, after a non-contested hearing, dispose of the proceedings pursuant to the provisions of section 1.30(c) (1) or (2) of the Commission's rules of practice and procedure. Under the procedure herein provided for, unless otherwise advised, it will be unnecessary for Applicant to appear or be represented at the hearing.

Protests or petitions to intervene may be filed with the Federal Power Commission, Washington 25, D.C., in accordance with the rules of practice and procedure (18 CFR 1.8 or 1.10) on or before June 22, 1962. Failure of any party to appear at and participate in the hearing shall be construed as waiver of and concurrence in omission herein of the intermediate decision procedure in cases where a request therefor is made.

GORDON M. GRANT,
Acting Secretary.

[F.R. Doc. 62-5452; Filed, June 5, 1962;
8:45 a.m.]

[Docket No. RI62-349 etc.]

GRAHAM-MICHAELIS DRILLING CO. ET AL.

Correction

MAY 23, 1962.

In the order providing for hearings on and suspension of proposed changes in rates, issued March 8, 1962 and published in the FEDERAL REGISTER, March 15, 1962 (F.R. Doc. 62-2489; 27 F.R. 2493). In the chart, Docket No. RI62-349, with regards to Rate Schedule No. 49: under column headed "Supp. No." delete "1" and substitute "2".

JOSEPH H. GUTRIDE,
Secretary.

[F.R. Doc. 62-5450; Filed, June 5, 1962;
8:45 a.m.]

FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

CONTINENTAL BANK AND TRUST CO.

Order Continuing Date for Show Cause Hearing

In the matter of The Continental Bank and Trust Company, Salt Lake City 10, Utah.

On June 28, 1961, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System issued an order for a hearing to be held commencing on September 6, 1961, in the offices of the Salt Lake City, Utah, Branch of the Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco, at which The Continental Bank and Trust Company, Salt Lake City, Utah, Respondent herein, should show cause why the Board should not require Respondent to surrender its stock in the Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco and to forfeit all rights and privileges of membership in the Federal Reserve System for failure to comply with Condition of Membership No. 2 imposed upon Respondent by the Board pursuant to section 9 of the Federal Reserve Act. That Condition of Membership, in substance, requires that the net capital and surplus funds of the Respondent should be adequate in relation to the character and condition of its assets and to its deposit liabilities and other corporate responsibilities, and that its capital shall not be reduced except with the permission of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

By order of August 21, 1961, the Board of Governors granted a joint motion for continuance of the show cause order for hearing, continuing said hearing to a date 30 days following announcement by the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia of its decision in the appeal taken by the Respondent from the June 27 and August 5, 1961 orders of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia in Civil Action No. 5097-60, The Continental Bank and Trust Company v. Martin et al.

May 3, 1962, the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit unanimously affirmed the District Court's orders of June 27, 1961, and August 5, 1961.

Under the Board's August 21, 1961 order, the hearing to show cause will commence on June 3, 1962, unless otherwise ordered. However, it is understood by the Board of Governors that the convenience of the parties hereto requires a continuance of the said June 3, 1962 date, and it is understood further that the parties hereto are in agreement as to the need for such continuance.

Accordingly, it is hereby ordered:

1. That the show cause hearing in this matter scheduled to commence on June 3, 1962, shall be continued to commence at 10 a.m. on July 23, 1962, in the offices of the Salt Lake City, Utah, Branch of the Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco.

2. That the said hearing be held in accordance with the substantive and procedural requirements designated and specified in the Board's original order for hearing dated June 28, 1961, except that paragraph numbered 4. of the said order is amended to provide that the July 23, 1962 hearing now scheduled will be private, attended only by the representatives, counsel, and witnesses of Respondent and of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, unless Respondent makes a written request to the Hearing Examiner that other per-

sons be permitted to attend or that the hearing be made public, in which event such other persons may attend or the hearing shall be open to the public as so requested.

3. That a certified copy of this order be forthwith served upon the Respondent by postage prepaid, registered mail, return receipt requested.

Dated at Washington, D.C., this 28th day of May, 1962.

By order of the Board of Governors.
[SEAL] MERRITT SHERMAN,
Secretary.

[F.R. Doc. 62-5453; Filed, June 5, 1962;
8:46 a.m.]

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[File No. 70-4042]

CONSOLIDATED NATURAL GAS CO. ET AL.

Notice of Filing of Application

MAY 28, 1962.

In the matter of Consolidated Natural Gas Company, 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York 20, New York; The East Ohio Gas Company, Lake Shore Pipe Line Company, 1717 East Ninth Street, Cleveland 14, Ohio; Hope Natural Gas Company, 445 West Main Street, Clarksburg, West Virginia; New York State Natural Gas Corporation, The Peoples Natural Gas Company, Two Gateway Center, Pittsburgh 22, Pennsylvania.

Notice is hereby given that Consolidated Natural Gas Company (Consolidated), a registered holding company and its wholly-owned subsidiary companies, The East Ohio Gas Company (East Ohio), Lake Shore Pipe Line Company (Lake Shore), Hope Natural Gas Company (Hope), New York State Natural Gas Corporation (New York State), and The Peoples Natural Gas Company (Peoples) have filed a joint application-declaration pursuant to the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935 (Act), designating sections 6 (a) and (b), 7, 9(a), 10, 12 (b) and (f) of the Act and Rules 43, 45, 50(a) (2) and (3), and 70(a) (4) (D) promulgated thereunder as applicable to the proposed transactions.

All interested persons are referred to said joint application-declaration on file at the office of this Commission for a statement of the proposed transactions which are summarized as follows:

To provide funds for four of its subsidiary companies to purchase inventory gas for storage, Consolidated proposes to issue and sell to commercial banks an aggregate of \$40,000,000 face amount of unsecured promissory notes having a maturity of not more than twelve months from the date of the first issuance. The interest rate on the notes will be the prime rate of interest of The Chase Manhattan Bank (Chase) in effect on the date of the first borrowing. The notes may be prepaid in whole or in part, from time to time, upon ten days' prior written notice, without premium.

The names of the banks and the face amount of the notes to be issued and sold to such banks are indicated below:

Bank	Participation
New York City:	
The Chase Manhattan Bank	\$13,775,000
The First National City Bank of New York	3,500,000
Morgan Guaranty Trust Co. of New York	3,200,000
Manufacturers Hanover Trust Co.	2,250,000
Bankers Trust Co.	1,750,000
Chemical Bank New York Trust Co.	1,750,000
Irving Trust Co.	1,750,000
OHIO	
Cleveland:	
The National City Bank of Cleveland	\$2,700,000
Union Commerce Bank	1,250,000
Central National Bank of Cleveland	400,000
Society National Bank of Cleveland	350,000
Akron:	
First National Bank of Akron	250,000
Akron Dime Bank	175,000
The Firestone Bank	175,000
Ashtabula:	
The Farmers National Bank & Trust Co of Ashtabula	50,000
Canton:	
The Harter Bank & Trust Co.	200,000
First National Bank of Canton	175,000
The Canton National Bank	75,000
The Peoples-Merchants Trust Co.	75,000
Painesville:	
The Lake County National Bank of Painesville, Ohio	50,000
Warren:	
The Second National Bank of Warren	50,000
The Union Savings & Trust Co.	50,000
Youngstown:	
The Mahoning National Bank of Youngstown	400,000
The Union National Bank of Youngstown, Ohio	175,000
PENNSYLVANIA	
Pittsburgh:	
Pittsburgh National Bank	\$1,600,000
Mellon National Bank and Trust Co.	1,500,000
The Union National Bank of Pittsburgh	500,000
Altoona:	
Altoona Central Bank and Trust Co.	125,000
Johnstown:	
Johnstown Bank and Trust Co.	50,000
United States National Bank in Johnstown	50,000
NEW YORK	
Elmira:	
Marine Midland Trust Co. of Southern New York	\$550,000
Syracuse:	
Marine Midland Trust Co. of Central New York	550,000
WEST VIRGINIA	
Clarksburg:	
The Empire National Bank of Clarksburg	\$125,000
The Union National Bank of Clarksburg	125,000
Morgantown:	
The First National Bank of Morgantown	125,000
Parkersburg:	
The Parkersburg National Bank	125,000
	40,000,000

Four subsidiary companies of Consolidated propose to issue and sell, and Consolidated proposes to acquire, short-term notes aggregating \$40,000,000. The notes will mature not more than twelve months from the date of the first borrowing by each subsidiary, will mature on or before the maturity date of Consolidated's related notes to banks and will bear the same rate of interest as such notes. The respective amounts of the subsidiary companies' short-term notes to be issued are as follows:

East Ohio	\$11,000,000
Hope	7,000,000
New York State	21,000,000
Peoples	1,000,000
	40,000,000

The above notes of the subsidiary companies and, in turn the related notes of Consolidated, will be paid as gas is withdrawn from storage and sold during the 1962-1963 heating season.

To provide part of the funds for financing their 1962 construction programs, three subsidiary companies of Consolidated propose to issue and sell, and Consolidated proposes to acquire, an aggregate of \$23,000,000 face amount of non-negotiable long-term notes from time to time during 1962. These notes will bear an interest rate of 4.60 percent per annum which is based on, and is substantially equal to, the effective cost of money obtained by Consolidated through the issuance and sale in March 1962 of its 4½ percent Debentures due March 1, 1987. These long-term notes will be issued in the face amounts and will mature as set forth below:

East Ohio, maturing \$400,000 each Feb. 28, 1967 to 1986, inclusive; and \$2,000,000 on Feb. 28, 1987	\$10,000,000
Hope, maturing \$325,000 each Feb. 28, 1967 to 1986, inclusive; and \$1,500,000 on Feb. 28, 1987	8,000,000
Peoples, maturing \$200,000 each Feb. 28, 1967 to 1986, inclusive; and \$1,000,000 in Feb. 28, 1986	5,000,000
	23,000,000

Lake Shore proposes to increase its authorized capital stock, par value \$10 per share, from 62,000 to 82,000 shares and issue and sell such additional 20,000 shares to Consolidated, from time to time during 1962. Such shares will be sold for cash equal to their aggregate par value of \$200,000, and the proceeds thereof will be used for the purpose of financing Lake Shore's 1962 construction program.

It is represented that the following State commissions, of the States in which the companies are doing business, have jurisdiction over the proposed transactions:

The Ohio Public Utilities Commission has jurisdiction over the issuance and sale of long-term notes proposed by East Ohio and the issuance and sale of capital stock by Lake Shore; The Public Service Commission of West Virginia has jurisdiction over the issuances and sales of long-term notes and short-term notes proposed by Hope; The Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission has jurisdiction

over the issuance and sale of long-term notes proposed by Peoples. Applications have been filed with the respective State commissions and the orders of such commissions, when issued, will be filed by amendment.

It is estimated that the fees and expenses in connection with the proposed transactions will not exceed \$1,000 exclusive of charges for services rendered at cost by the system service company.

Notice is further given that any interested person may, not later than June 13, 1962, request in writing that a hearing be held on such matters stating the nature of his interest, the reasons for such request, and the issues of fact or law raised by the joint application-declaration which he desires to controvert; or he may request that he be notified if the Commission should order a hearing thereon. Any request should be addressed: Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, Washington 25, D.C. A copy of such request should be served personally or by mail (air mail if the person being served is located more than 500 miles from the point of mailing) upon applicants-declarants, and proof of service (by affidavit or, in case of an attorney-at-law, by certificate) should be filed contemporaneously with the request. At any time after that date, the joint application-declaration, as amended, may be granted and permitted to become effective as provided in Rule 23 of the rules and regulations promulgated under the Act, or the Commission may grant exemption from such rules as provided in Rules 20(a) and 100 thereof or take such other action as it may deem appropriate.

By the Commission.

[SEAL] NELLYE A. THORSEN,
Assistant Secretary.

[F.R. Doc. 62-5458; Filed, June 5, 1962;
8:47 a.m.]

[File No. 24SF-2986]

IMPERIAL MINING, INC.

Order Temporarily Suspending Exemption, Statement of Reasons Thereof and Notice of Opportunity for Hearing

MAY 31, 1962.

I. Imperial Mining, Inc. (the issuer), 130 Fourth Street, Las Vegas, Nevada, filed with the Commission on November 15, 1961, a Notification and Offering Circular relating to an offering of 3,000,000 shares of \$.10 par value common stock, all for the aggregate price of not to exceed \$300,000, for the purpose of obtaining an exemption from the registration requirements of the Securities Act of 1933, as amended, pursuant to section 3(b) thereof and regulation A promulgated thereunder.

II. The Commission has reason to believe that:

A. The issuer in the offer and sale of its securities is using an Offering Circular filed May 11, 1962, dated March 10, 1962, which was not filed as an exhibit to the Notification pursuant to Rule 256(a) of Regulation A and Form 1-A thereunder, does not contain the information speci-

fied in Schedule I of Form 1-A and omits to state material facts necessary to make the statements made therein not misleading, with respect to:

1. The offering price of the shares offered,
2. The interests of officers, directors, promoters and affiliates in the issuer,
3. The names of the promoters,
4. The annual remuneration of officers and directors,
5. The nature and quality of the mineralized deposits and risks of title to mining claims,
6. A description of the securities offered,
7. The right of shareholders to determine, under certain circumstances, the use to which the proceeds will be put, including the right to return of unexpended funds by liquidation of issuer,
8. The nature of the property interests of the issuer in its mining properties,
9. The procuring of new properties and selling of present interests,
10. The expenses of the offering,
11. The intention of issuer as to employment of an engineering and mining superintendent and the use of proceeds in paying his salary.

B. The offering is being and would be made in violation of section 17 of the Securities Act of 1933, as amended.

III. *It is ordered*, Pursuant to Rule 261(a) of the general rules and regulations under the Securities Act of 1933, as amended, that the exemption under Regulation A be and hereby is, temporarily suspended.

Notice is hereby given that any person having an interest in the matter may file with the Secretary of the Commission a written request for hearing within thirty days after the entry of this order; that within twenty days after receipt of such request the Commission will, or at any time upon its own motion may, set the matter down for hearing at a place to be designated by the Commission, for the purpose of determining whether this order of suspension should be vacated or made permanent, without prejudice, however, to the consideration and presentation of additional matters at the hearing; that, if no hearing is requested and none is ordered by the Commission, this order shall become permanent on the thirtieth day after its entry and shall remain in effect unless or until it is modified or vacated by the Commission; and that notice of the time and place for any hearing will promptly be given by the Commission.

By the Commission.

[SEAL] NELLYE A. THORSEN,
Assistant Secretary.

[F.R. Doc. 62-5459; Filed, June 5, 1962;
8:47 a.m.]

TARIFF COMMISSION

[87-456-1]

CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF THE TARIFF SCHEDULES

Notice of Hearing and Opportunity To Present Written Views

The United States Tariff Commission hereby gives notice that on June 18, 1962,

No. 109—5

a public hearing will be held for the purpose of affording interested parties an opportunity to be heard in connection with the Commission's further consideration of certain provisions of the Tariff Schedules of the United States which are identified in Annex I of this notice. This action is taken pursuant to sections 101 (b) (4) and (c) of the Tariff Classification Act of 1962 (Public Law 87-456, approved May 24, 1962) on the basis of further information received by the Tariff Commission which in its judgment justifies further consideration of the provisions in question.

The Tariff Schedules of the United States are set forth in the report of the Tariff Commission entitled "Tariff Classification Study, Proposed Revised Tariff Schedules of the United States," dated November 15, 1960, as changed by the "First Supplemental Report" of January 1962. Copies of the above mentioned Tariff Schedules are available for inspection at the office of the Tariff Commission in Washington, D.C., and at its New York office, at United States customhouses, at Department of Commerce field offices, and at most large libraries in the United States; copies may be purchased from the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C.

Information and views may be submitted either in writing or by oral testimony at the public hearing, or both. Fifteen (15) copies of written statements must be submitted. Each such statement should be submitted as early as possible, and, in order to assure due consideration, must be submitted not later than June 22, 1962. Written statements and oral testimony must be limited to the provisions identified in Annex I of this notice. Submissions which deal with other matters are not relevant and will not be entertained.

Request for appearance at the public hearing. Request to appear at the hearing must be filed in writing with the Secretary of the Commission not later than June 13, 1962. Any such request must include (1) the name, address, telephone number, and organization of the person filing the request, and the name or names of any witness or witnesses who will testify; (2) the particular provision on which testimony will be presented.

The public hearing will begin at 10 a.m. e.d.s.t. on Monday, the 18th day of June 1962, in the Hearing Room of the Tariff Commission Building, Eighth and E Streets NW., Washington, D.C. Parties who have properly entered an appearance by June 13, 1962, as indicated above, will be notified individually of the date on which they are scheduled to appear. Such notice will be sent as soon as possible after June 13, 1962 (the closing date for requests to appear).

All communications regarding this public hearing, including requests to appear, should be addressed to the Secretary, United States Tariff Commission, Washington 25, D.C.

Issued: June 1, 1962.

By order of the Commission.

[SEAL] DONN N. BENT,
Secretary.

ANNEX I

PROVISIONS OF THE TARIFF SCHEDULES OF THE UNITED STATES UNDER CONSIDERATION

1. Headnote 10(e) (1) of the general headnotes and rules of interpretation relating to classifications controlled by use other than actual use. Further consideration is being given to determine whether clarification is required.

2. Items 148.42-50, part 9B, schedule 1, covering *olives, in brine*. Further consideration is being given to determine whether the existing rates of duty expressed on a gallon basis should be converted to a pound basis.

3. Item 167.15, part 12B, schedule 1, covering *cider*. Further consideration is being given to determine whether the product description for this product is too restrictive.

4. Item 182.32, part 15B, schedule 1, covering *chewing gum*. Further consideration is being given to determine whether the rate of duty in rate column numbered 1 is incorrect.

5. Items 245.00-30, part 3, schedule 2, covering *hardboard*. Further consideration is being given to determine whether changes are required for purposes of clarification and for properly reflecting the equivalent of the existing tariff levels.

6. Headnote 4, part 2D, schedule 6, in regard to *continuous cast aluminum products*. Further consideration is being given to determine whether this headnote should be deleted or changed.

7. Items 649.43-49, part 3E, schedule 6, covering *interchangeable tools for hand tools or for machine tools*. Further consideration is being given to determine whether separate subordinate description should be inserted for certain files (including rotary files) and rasps to avoid significant rate increases on such products.

8. Headnote 3(b), part 1A, schedule 7. Further consideration is being given to determine whether changes should be made in that part of this headnote which provides that *footwear* in item 700.50, if wholly or in part of natural rubber, shall be dutiable on the basis of American selling price.

9. Items 709.01-27, part 2B, schedule 7, *medical, dental, surgical and veterinary instruments and apparatus, and parts thereof*. Further consideration is being given to determine whether subordinate provisions should be inserted for *percussion hammers* and *otoscopes* to avoid significant increases in the rates of duty applicable thereto.

10. Headnote 2(b), part 4B, schedule 7, defining "inlaid" as used with regard to *linoleum* (item 728.05). Further consideration is being given to determine whether the headnote requires clarification to avoid a possible unwarranted rate increase on certain types of linoleum.

11. Item 808.00, part 1C, schedule 8; covering *substantial containers and holders*. Further consideration is being given to determine whether this provision should be enlarged to provide for the free entry of containers and holders which are determined by the Secretary of the Treasury to be instruments of international traffic.

[F.R. Doc. 62-5462; Filed, June 5, 1962;
8:47 a.m.]

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

[Notice 646]

MOTOR CARRIER TRANSFER PROCEEDINGS

JUNE 1, 1962.

Synopses of orders entered pursuant to section 212(b) of the Interstate Com-

merce Act, and rules and regulations prescribed thereunder (49 CFR Part 179), appear below:

As provided in the Commission's special rules of practice any interested person may file a petition seeking reconsideration of the following numbered proceedings within 20 days from the date of publication of this notice. Pursuant to section 17(8) of the Interstate Commerce Act, the filing of such a petition will postpone the effective date of the order in that proceeding pending its disposition. The matters relied upon by petitioners must be specified in their petitions with particularity.

No. MC-FC 65067. By order of May 29, 1962, the Transfer Board approved the transfer to A. F. Murch Company, a corporation, Paw Paw, Mich., of Permit No. MC 119394, issued February 16, 1961, to Leonard McKee, doing business as Leonard McKee Lines, Kalamazoo, Mich., authorizing the transportation of: Waste paper and scrap paper stock, from points in New York (except points on Long Island) Connecticut, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Rhode Island, to Plainwell, Mich., and points in Kalamazoo County, Mich. J. M. Neath, Jr., 300 Michigan Trust Building, Grand Rapids 2, Mich., attorney for applicants.

[SEAL] HAROLD D. McCoy,
Secretary.

[F.R. Doc. 62-5464; Filed, June 5, 1962;
8:47 a.m.]

[Notice 449]

MOTOR CARRIER APPLICATIONS AND CERTAIN OTHER PROCEEDINGS

JUNE 1, 1962.

The following publications are governed by the Interstate Commerce Commission's general rules of practice including special rules (49 CFR 1.241) governing notice of filing of applications by motor carriers of property or passengers of brokers under sections 206, 209, and 211 of the Interstate Commerce Act and certain other proceedings with respect thereto.

All hearings and prehearing conferences will be called at 9:30 a.m., United States standard time (or 9:30 o'clock a.m., local daylight saving time, if that time is observed), unless otherwise specified.

APPLICATIONS ASSIGNED FOR ORAL HEARING OR PRE-HEARING CONFERENCE

MOTOR CARRIERS OF PROPERTY

The applications immediately following are assigned for hearing at the time and place designated in the notice of filing as here published in each proceeding. All of the proceedings are subject to the special rules of procedure for hearing outlined below.

SPECIAL RULES OF PROCEDURE FOR HEARING

(1) All of the testimony to be adduced by applicant's company witness shall be in the form of written statements which shall be submitted at the hearing at the time and place indicated.

(2) All of the written statements by applicants' company witnesses shall be offered in evidence at the hearing in the same manner as any other type of evidence. The witnesses submitting the written statements shall be made available at the hearing for cross-examination, if such becomes necessary.

(3) The written statements by applicants' company witnesses, if received in evidence, will be accepted as exhibits. To the extent the written statements refer to attached documents such as copies of operating authority, etc., they should be referred to in written statement as numbered appendices thereto.

(4) The admissibility of the evidence contained in the written statements and the appendices thereto, will at the time of offer, be subject to the same rules as if the evidence was produced in the usual manner.

(5) Supplemental testimony by a witness to correct errors or to supply inadvertent omissions in his written statement is permissible.

No. MC 4966 (Sub-No. 11) (CORRECTION), filed March 2, 1962, published FEDERAL REGISTER, issue of May 9, 1962, corrected May 28, 1962, and republished, as corrected, this issue. Applicant: JONES TRANSFER COMPANY, a corporation, 927 Washington Street, Monroe, Mich. Applicant's attorney: William B. Elmer, 1800 Buhl Building, Detroit 26, Mich. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over regular routes, transporting: *General commodities* (except those of unusual value, Classes A and B explosives, household goods as defined by the Commission, commodities in bulk, and those requiring special equipment), serving the site of the plant of Ford Motor Co. located at the intersection of 23 Mile Road and Mound Road, Macomb County, Mich., as an off-route point in connection with applicant's presently authorized regular-route operations to and from Detroit, Mich.

NOTE: The purpose of this republication is to correct the authority sought to operate over regular routes in lieu of irregular routes as previously published and to specifically locate the proposed plant site.

HEARING: Remains as assigned June 14, 1962, at the Federal Building, Lansing, Mich., before Joint Board No. 76, or, if the Joint Board waives its right to participate, before Examiner William E. Messer.

No. MC 59185 (Sub-No. 27), filed May 25, 1962. Applicant: HIGHWAY EXPRESS, INC., 2416 West Superior Avenue, Cleveland 13, Ohio. Applicant's representative: G. H. Dilla, 5275 Ridge Road, Cleveland 29, Ohio. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over regular routes, transporting: *General commodities* (except commodities in bulk and commodities requiring special equipment), serving the site of the Ford Motor Company plant at or near the junction of Mound Road and 23 Mile Road in Macomb County, Mich., as an off-route point in connection with applicant's regular-route operations.

HEARING: June 14, 1962, at the Federal Building, Lansing, Mich., before Joint Board No. 76, or, if the Joint Board waives its right to participate, before Examiner William E. Messer.

No. MC 115331 (Sub-No. 23) (AMENDMENT), filed December 13, 1962, published FEDERAL REGISTER, issue May 16, 1962, amended May 31, 1962, and republished as amended this issue. Applicant: TRUCK TRANSPORT, INC., Highway 61, Crystal City, Mo. Applicant's representative: A. A. Marshall, 305 Buder Building, St. Louis 1, Mo. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Anyhydrous ammonia, aqua ammonia, and fertilizers*, in bulk, from Muscatine, Iowa, and points within five (5) miles thereof, to points in Illinois, Iowa, Indiana, Kansas, Kentucky, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wisconsin.

NOTE: The purpose of this republication is to broaden the scope of the authority previously sought.

HEARING: June 27, 1962, at the Midland Hotel, Chicago, Ill., before Examiner Richard White.

By the Commission.

[SEAL] HAROLD D. McCoy,
Secretary.

[F.R. Doc. 62-5465; Filed, June 5, 1962;
8:48 a.m.]

[Notice 213]

MOTOR CARRIER ALTERNATE ROUTE DEVIATION NOTICES

JUNE 1, 1962.

The following letter-notices of proposals to operate over deviation routes for operating convenience only with service at no intermediate points have been filed with the Interstate Commerce Commission, under the Commission's deviation rules revised, 1957 (49 CFR 211.1(c)(8)) and notice thereof to all interested persons is hereby given as provided in such rules (49 CFR 211.1(d)(4)).

Protests against the use of any proposed deviation route herein described may be filed with the Interstate Commerce Commission in the manner and form provided in such rules (49 CFR 211.1(e)) at any time but will not operate to stay commencement of the proposed operations unless filed within 30 days from the date of publication.

Successively filed letter-notices of the same carrier under the Commission's deviation rules revised, 1957, will be numbered consecutively for convenience in identification and protests if any should refer to such letter-notices by number.

MOTOR CARRIERS OF PROPERTY

No. MC 6894 (Deviation No. 3), MELVIN TRUCKING COMPANY, 1818 South Washington Street, Peoria, Ill., filed May 25, 1962. Carrier proposes to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, of *general commodities*, with certain exceptions, over a deviation route between Keokuk, Iowa and St. Louis, Mo., over U.S. Highway 61, for operating

convenience only, serving no intermediate points. The notice indicates that the carrier is presently authorized to transport the same commodities over pertinent service routes as follows: From Peoria, Ill., over Illinois Highway 88 to junction Illinois Highway 93, thence over Illinois Highway 93 to junction Illinois Highway 91, (formerly portion Illinois Highway 93), thence over Illinois Highway 91 to junction U.S. Highway 34, thence over U.S. Highway 34 to Kewanee, Ill., return over U.S. Highway 34 to junction Illinois Highway 91, thence over U.S. Highway 34 to junction U.S. Highway 67, thence over U.S. Highway 67 to Macomb, Ill., thence over U.S. Highway 136 to the Illinois-Iowa State line, thence across the Mississippi River to Keokuk; from Peoria, Ill., over U.S. Highway 24 to Banner, Ill., thence over Illinois Highway 9 to Niota, Ill., thence across the Mississippi River to Fort Madison, Iowa, thence over U.S. Highway 61 to Keokuk; from Peoria, Ill., over U.S. Highway 150 to Morton, Ill., thence over Illinois Highway 121 to Lincoln, Ill.; and from Chicago, Ill., over U.S. Highway 66 to junction Alternate U.S. Highway 66, thence over Alternate U.S. Highway 66 to junction U.S. Highway 66, thence over U.S. Highway 66 to junction unnumbered highway, thence over unnumbered highway, via Staunton, Ill., to junction Illinois Highway 4, thence over Illinois Highway 4 to junction U.S. Highway 66, thence over U.S. Highway 66 to junction City U.S. Highway 66, thence over City U.S. Highway 66 to St. Louis, and return over the same routes.

No. MC 30311 (Deviation No. 3), A.C.E.—FREIGHT, INC., 395 Baird Street, Akron, Ohio, filed May 24, 1962. Carrier proposes to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, of *general commodities*, with certain exceptions, over deviation routes as follows: (A) from Cleveland, Ohio, over Interstate Highway 90 to junction New York Thruway, thence over New York Thruway to junction Massachusetts Turnpike, thence over Massachusetts Turnpike to Boston, Mass., (B) from Chicago, Ill., over Indiana Turnpike to junction Ohio Turnpike, thence over Ohio Turnpike to junction Pennsylvania Turnpike, thence over Pennsylvania Turnpike to junction New Jersey Turnpike, thence over New Jersey Turnpike to Newark, N.J., thence over U.S. Highway 1 to junction Interstate Highway 95, (C) from Newark, N.J., over New Jersey Turnpike to junction U.S. Highway 46, thence over U.S. Highway 46 to junction U.S. Highway 1, thence over U.S. Highway 1 to junction Interstate Highway 95, thence over Interstate Highway 95 to junction Connecticut Turnpike, thence over Connecticut Turnpike to the Connecticut-Rhode Island State line, thence over U.S. Highway 6 to Providence, R.I., (D) from Hartford, Conn., over Interstate Highway 91 to Springfield, Mass., (E) from Hartford, Conn., over U.S. Highway 44 to junction Interstate Highway 84, thence over Interstate Highway 84 to Sturbridge, Mass., (F) from the junction of Rhode Island Highway 3 and Interstate Highway 95, near Nooseneck Hill, R.I., over Interstate Highway 95 to junction Rhode Island

Highway 2, thence over Rhode Island Highway 2 to junction Rhode Island Highway 3; (G) from Boston, Mass., over Massachusetts Highway 28 to junction Massachusetts Highway 24, thence over Massachusetts Highway 24 to Fall River, Mass.; (H) from Providence, R.I., over Interstate Highway 195 to junction U.S. Highway 6, thence over U.S. Highway 6 to Fall River, Mass.; (I) from Akron, Ohio, over Ohio Highway 18 to junction Interstate Highway 71, thence over Interstate Highway 71 to junction U.S. Highway 36, thence over U.S. Highway 36 to Delaware, Ohio, thence over U.S. Highway 42 to junction U.S. Highway 40, also continuing on Interstate Highway 71 to junction Interstate Highway 270, when completed, thence over Interstate Highway 270 to junction U.S. Highway 40, thence over U.S. Highway 40, including relocated U.S. Highway 40 or Interstate Highway 70, when completed, to Indianapolis, Ind.; and (J) from Fremont, Ohio, over U.S. Highway 20 to junction Alternate U.S. Highway 20, at Maumee, Ohio, thence over Alternate U.S. Highway 20 to junction U.S. Highway 20, thence over U.S. Highway 20 to Elkhardt, Ind., and return over the same routes, for operating convenience only, serving no intermediate points. The notice indicates that the carrier is presently authorized to transport the same commodities over pertinent service routes as follows: From Akron, over Ohio Highway 8 to Cleveland, thence over U.S. Highway 20 to New York Highway 78, thence over New York Highway 78 to junction New York Highway 5, thence over New York Highway 5 to Schenectady, N.Y., thence over New York Highway 7 to Troy, N.Y., thence over New York Highway 2 to the New York-Massachusetts State line, thence over Massachusetts Highway 2 to junction Massachusetts Highway 2A, near Westminster, Mass., thence over Massachusetts Highway 2A to junction Massachusetts Highway 2, thence over Massachusetts Highway 2 to Boston; from Chicago over U.S. Highway 41 to junction U.S. Highway 30, thence over U.S. Highway 30 to Van Wert, Ohio, thence over U.S. Highway 30N to Beaver Dam, Ohio, thence over U.S. Highway 25 to Findlay, Ohio, thence over U.S. Highway 224 to New Castle, Pa., thence over U.S. Highway 422 to Ebensburg, Pa., thence over U.S. Highway 22 to Newark, thence over U.S. Highway 1 to Providence; from Hartford over U.S. Highway 5 to Springfield; from Hartford over U.S. Highway 44 to junction Connecticut Highway 30, thence over Connecticut Highway 30 to junction Connecticut Highway 20, thence over Connecticut Highway 20 to junction Connecticut Highway 19, at Stafford Springs, Conn., thence over Connecticut Highway 19 to junction Connecticut Highway 15, thence over Connecticut Highway 15 to the Connecticut-Massachusetts State line, thence over Massachusetts Highway 15 to Sturbridge; from Nooseneck Hill over Rhode Island Highway 3 to junction Rhode Island Highway 2; from Boston over Massachusetts Highway 138 to Fall River; from Providence over U.S. Highway 6 to Fall River; from Akron over

Ohio Highway 18 to junction U.S. Highway 42, at Medina, Ohio, thence over U.S. Highway 42 to junction U.S. Highway 30, at Mansfield, Ohio, thence over U.S. Highway 30N to Beaver Dam, thence over U.S. Highway 25 to Wapakoneta, Ohio, thence over U.S. Highway 33 to junction Ohio Highway 29, thence over Ohio Highway 29 to the Ohio-Indiana State line, thence over Indiana Highway 67 to Indianapolis; and from Fremont over U.S. Highway 6 to junction U.S. Highway 33, thence over U.S. Highway 33 to Elkhart, and return over the same routes.

No. MC 69116 (Deviation No. 13), SPECTOR FREIGHT SYSTEM, INC., 3100 South Wolcott Avenue, Chicago 8, Ill., filed May 21, 1962. Carrier proposes to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, of *general commodities*, with certain exceptions, over a deviation route between Peoria, Ill., and Indianapolis, Ind., over Interstate Highway 74, for operating convenience only, serving no intermediate points. The notice indicates that the carrier is presently authorized to transport the same commodities over a pertinent service route as follows: From Peoria over U.S. Highway 24 to junction U.S. Highway 52, thence over U.S. Highway 52 to Indianapolis, and return over the same route.

No. MC 98088 (Deviation No. 1), LINDLEY TRUCKING SERVICE, INC., 3818 Vandalia Road, Des Moines, Iowa, filed May 21, 1962. Carrier proposes to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, of *general commodities*, with certain exceptions, over deviation routes as follows: (A) From National Stockyards, Ill., over U.S. Highway 67 to Jacksonville, Ill., thence over Illinois Highway 104 to Meredosia, Ill., thence over Illinois Highway 99 to Mt. Sterling, Ill., thence over U.S. Highway 24 to Taylor, Mo., thence over U.S. Highway 61 to Wayland, Mo., thence over U.S. Highway 136 to Kahoka, Mo., and (B) from National Stockyards, Ill., over U.S. Highway 67 to Jacksonville, Ill., thence over Illinois Highway 104 to Meredosia, Ill., thence over Illinois Highway 99 to Mt. Sterling, Ill., thence over U.S. Highway 24 to Quincy, Ill., thence over Illinois Highway 96 to Hamilton, Ill., thence over U.S. Highway 136 to Kahoka, Mo., and return over the same routes, for operating convenience only, serving no intermediate points. The notice indicates that the carrier is presently authorized to transport the same commodities over a pertinent service route as follows: From Kahoka over U.S. Highway 136 to junction U.S. Highway 61, thence over U.S. Highway 61, via Taylor, to St. Louis, Mo., thence across the Mississippi River to National Stockyards, and return over the same route.

No. MC 109972 (Deviation No. 6), HARRIS EXPRESS, INC., 1425 North Tryon Street, P.O. Box 10091, Charlotte 1, N.C., filed May 21, 1962. Carrier proposes to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, of *general commodities*, with certain exceptions, over a deviation route as follows: From the junction of By-Pass U.S. Highway 158 and U.S. Highway 15, two miles south of Oxford, N.C., over By-Pass U.S. Highway 158 to Henderson, N.C., thence over Interstate

Highway 85 to junction U.S. Highway 1, and return over the same route, for operating convenience only, serving no intermediate points. The notice indicates that the carrier is presently authorized to transport the same commodities over a pertinent service route as follows: From Durham, N.C., over U.S. Highway 15 to Oxford, thence over U.S. Highway 158 to Henderson, thence over U.S. Highway 1 to Baltimore, Md., and return over the same route.

No. MC 112713 (Deviation No. 6), YELLOW TRANSIT FREIGHT LINES, INC., 92d at State Line, Kansas City 14, Mo., filed May 23, 1962. Carrier proposes to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, of *general commodities*, with certain exceptions over a deviation route between Dallas and Houston, Tex., over Interstate Highway 45, for operating convenience only, serving no intermediate points. The notice indicates that the carrier is presently authorized to transport the same commodities over a pertinent service route as follows: From Dallas over U.S. Highway 75 to Houston, and return over the same route.

MOTOR CARRIERS OF PASSENGERS

No. MC 1501 (Deviation No. 79), THE GREYHOUND CORPORATION, 1740 Main Street, Kansas City 8, Mo., filed May 24, 1962. Carrier proposes to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, of *passengers and their baggage*, over a deviation route as follows: From the junction of Wisconsin Highway 67 (formerly Wisconsin Highway 57), and Wisconsin Highway 57, one mile east of Kiel, Wis., over relocated Wisconsin Highway 57 to junction Wisconsin Highway 23 (formerly Wisconsin Highway 57), and return over the same route, for operating convenience only, serving no intermediate points. The notice indicates that the carrier is presently authorized to transport passengers over a pertinent service route as follows: From Milwaukee, Wis., over Milwaukee County Highway D to junction Wisconsin Highway 57, thence over Wisconsin Highway 57 to Green Bay, Wis., and return over the same route.

No. MC 1501 (Deviation No. 80), THE GREYHOUND CORPORATION, 1740 Main Street, Kansas City 8, Mo., filed May 25, 1962. Carrier proposes to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, of *passengers and their baggage*, over a deviation route as follows: From the junction of U.S. Highway 66 and Interstate Highway 44, east of Tulsa, Okla., over Interstate Highway 44 to junction U.S. Highway 66, southwest of Tulsa, Okla., and return over the same route, for operating convenience only, serving no intermediate points. The notice indicates that the carrier is presently authorized to transport passengers over pertinent service routes as follows: From Baxter Springs, Kans., over U.S. Highway 66, via Commerce and Sapulpa, Okla., to junction unnumbered highway (formerly U.S. Highway 66) near Edmond, Okla., thence over unnumbered highway to Edmond, Okla., thence over Oklahoma Highway 77 to Oklahoma City, Okla., thence over U.S. Highway 66, via Amarillo, Tex., to Albuquerque, N. Mex.;

also from Baxter Springs over U.S. Highway 66 to junction U.S. Highway 69, thence over U.S. Highway 69 to Commerce, Okla., and return over the same routes.

No. MC 109736 (Deviation No. 3), CAPITOL BUS COMPANY, Fourth and Chestnut Street, Harrisburg, Pa., filed May 10, 1962. Attorney James E. Wilson, 1111 E Street NW., Washington 4, D.C. Carrier proposes to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, of *passengers and their baggage*, over a deviation route between Harrisburg, Pa. and Baltimore, Md., over Interstate Highway 83, for operating convenience only, serving no intermediate points. The notice indicates that the carrier is presently authorized to transport passengers over a pertinent service route as follows: From Harrisburg over U.S. Highway 15 to junction Pennsylvania Highway 94, thence over Pennsylvania Highway 94 to the Pennsylvania-Maryland State line, thence over Maryland Highway 30 to junction U.S. Highway 140, thence over U.S. Highway 140 to Baltimore, and return over the same route.

By the Commission.

[SEAL] HAROLD D. McCoy,
Secretary.

[F.R. Doc. 62-5466; Filed, June 5, 1962;
8:48 a.m.]

[Notice 448]

MOTOR CARRIER APPLICATIONS AND CERTAIN OTHER PROCEEDINGS

JUNE 1, 1962.

The following publications are governed by the Interstate Commerce Commission's general rules of practice including special rules (49 CFR 1.241) governing notice of filing of applications by motor carriers of property or passengers of brokers under sections 206, 209, and 211 of the Interstate Commerce Act and certain other proceedings with respect thereto.

All hearings and prehearing conferences will be called at 9:30 a.m., United States standard time (or 9:30 a.m., local daylight saving time, if that time is observed), unless otherwise specified.

APPLICATIONS ASSIGNED FOR ORAL HEARING OR PREHEARING CONFERENCE

MOTOR CARRIERS OF PROPERTY

No. MC 1494 (Sub-No. 20), filed April 2, 1962. Applicant: GROSS COMMON CARRIER, INC., 660 West Grand Avenue, Wisconsin Rapids, Wis. Applicant's attorney: Edward Solie, 1 South Pinckney Street, Madison 3, Wis. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over regular routes, transporting: *General commodities* (except those of unusual value, Classes A and B explosives, household goods as defined by the Commission, commodities in bulk, and those requiring special equipment), (1) between Milwaukee, Wis., and junction Wisconsin Highway 57 and Wisconsin Highway 23 (east of Plymouth, Wis.); from Milwaukee over Wisconsin Highway 57 to junction with Wisconsin Highway 23, and return over

the same route, serving no intermediate points, as an alternate route for operating convenience only in connection with applicant's regular-route operations, and (2) between Milwaukee, Wis., and Sheboygan, Wis.; from Milwaukee over U.S. Highway 141 to Sheboygan, and return over the same route, serving no intermediate points, as an alternate route for operating convenience only in connection with applicant's regular-route operations.

HEARING: July 19, 1962, at the Wisconsin Public Service Commission, Madison, Wis., before Joint Board No. 96.

No. MC 10761 (Sub-No. 121), filed April 16, 1962. Applicant: TRANS-AMERICAN FREIGHT LINES, INC., 1700 North Waterman Avenue, Detroit 9, Mich. Applicant's attorney: Howell Ellis, Room 1210-12, Fidelity Building, 111 Monument Circle, Indianapolis 4, Ind. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over regular routes, transporting: *General commodities* (except those of unusual value, Classes A and B explosives, household goods as defined by the Commission, commodities in bulk, commodities requiring special equipment, and those injurious or contaminating to other lading), serving De Kalb, Ill., as an intermediate point in connection with applicant's regular-route operation between Chicago, Ill., and Jefferson, Iowa.

HEARING: July 16, 1962, at the Midland Hotel, 172 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill., before Joint Board No. 149.

No. MC 10761 (Sub-No. 122), filed April 16, 1962. Applicant: TRANSAMERICAN FREIGHT LINES, INC., 1700 North Waterman Avenue, Detroit 9, Mich. Applicant's attorney: Howell Ellis Room 1210-12, Fidelity Building, 111 Monument Circle, Indianapolis 4, Ind. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over regular routes, transporting: *General commodities* (except those of unusual value, Classes A and B explosives, household goods as defined by the Commission, commodities in bulk, commodities requiring special equipment, and those injurious or contaminating to other lading), serving Carlinville, Ill., as an off-route point in connection with applicant's regular-route operations between Chicago, Ill., and St. Louis, Mo.

HEARING: July 16, 1962, at the Midland Hotel, 172 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill., before Joint Board No. 149.

No. MC 26771 (Sub-No. 14), filed March 26, 1962. Applicant: NESTOR BROS., INC., 8 Loder Avenue, Endicott, N.Y. Applicant's attorney: Glenn F. Morgan, 925 Whitfield Avenue, Sarasota, Fla. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over regular routes, transporting: *General commodities* (except those of unusual value, Classes A and B explosives, household goods as defined by the Commission, commodities in bulk and those requiring special equipment), serving points in Westchester County, N.Y., as off-route points in connection with applicant's present regular-route authority between New York, N.Y., and Binghamton, N.Y.

HEARING: July 9, 1962, at 346 Broadway, New York, N.Y., before Examiner W. Elliott Nefflen.

No. MC 29079 (Sub-No. 13), filed May 24, 1962. Applicant: BRADA MILLER FREIGHT SYSTEM, INC., 1200 Home Avenue, Kokomo, Ind., Applicant's attorney: Howell Ellis, Suite 1210-12 Fidelity Building, 111 Monument Circle, Indianapolis 4, Ind. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over regular routes, transporting: *General commodities* (except those of unusual value, Classes A and B explosives, household goods as defined by the Commission, and liquid commodities), in bulk, serving the plant site of the Ford Motor Co., located at the intersection of 23 Mile Road and Mound Road, Macomb County, Mich., as an off-route point in connection with applicant's authorized regular route operations.

HEARING: June 14, 1962, at the Federal Building, Lansing, Mich., before Joint Board No. 76, or, if the Joint Board waives its right to participate before Examiner William E. Messer.

No. MC 29963 (Sub-No. 4), filed March 15, 1962. Applicant: R. T. GIFFORD TRANSPORTATION, INC., 336 Allens Avenue, Providence, R.I. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *General commodities* (except those of unusual value, livestock, Classes A and B explosives, household goods as defined by the Commission, commodities in bulk, commodities requiring special equipment, and those injurious or contaminating to other lading), as follows: (1) between Middleboro, Mass., and Plymouth, Mass., (2) between Providence, R.I., and Plymouth, Mass., and (3) between Providence, R.I., and North Attleboro, Mass.

HEARING: July 9, 1962, at the Federal Building, Providence, R.I., before Joint Board No. 18.

No. MC 31367 (Sub-No. 21), filed April 26, 1962. Applicant: H. F. CAMPBELL & SON, INC., R.D. 1, Millerstown, Pa. Applicant's attorney: John M. Musselman, 400 North Third Street, Harrisburg, Pa. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Frozen fruits and vegetables*, (1) from Centre Hall, and points in Potter Township, Centre County, Pa., to Birmingham, Ala., Atlanta, Ga., Jacksonville, Miami, and Tampa, Fla., Chicago, Ill., Lake Odessa, Mich., Asheville, Charlotte, and Raleigh, N.C., and Cleveland and Toledo, Ohio, (2) from Clayton, Del., to Cleveland and Toledo, Ohio, and Centre Hall, and points in Potter Township, Centre County, Pa., (3) from Ridgely, Md., to Chicago, Ill., Cleveland, Napoleon, and Toledo, Ohio, and Centre Hall, and points in Potter Township, Centre County, Pa., and (4) from Whiteford, Md., to Chicago, Ill., Cleveland and Toledo, Ohio, and Centre Hall, and points in Potter Township, Centre County, Pa., and *empty containers or other such incidental facilities* (not specified), used in transporting the commodities above, on return.

HEARING: July 10, 1962, at the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission, Harrisburg, Pa., before Examiner Joseph A. Reilly.

No. MC 31389 (Sub-No. 51), filed April 23, 1962. Applicant: McLEAN TRUCKING COMPANY, a corporation, P.O. Box 213, Winston-Salem, N.C. Applicant's attorney: David G. Macdonald, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington 6, D.C. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over regular routes, transporting: *General commodities* (except those of unusual value, Classes A and B explosives, livestock, household goods as defined by the Commission, commodities in bulk, and those requiring special equipment), serving points in North Carolina within 100 miles of High Point, N.C., other than authorized regular-route service points, as off-route points, in connection with applicant's authorized service routes in North Carolina within 100 miles of High Point set forth in MC 31389, restricted to shipments to, from or through Winston-Salem, N.C.

NOTE: Applicant states "it now holds authority to serve points within 100 miles of High Point in North Carolina as off-route points in connection with its regular-route between High Point and New York, N.Y., and presently transports shipments between such points in the 100 mile area and Winston-Salem through use of that authority in combination with regular-route authorities between High Point and Winston-Salem and Greensboro and Winston-Salem. The purpose of this application is to permit direct movement to and from Winston-Salem which serves as applicant's principal break-bulk terminal." Applicant further states "it controls Hayes Freight Lines, Inc., which holds authority issued in Docket No. MC 42329."

HEARING: July 13, 1962, at the U.S. Court Rooms, Uptown Post Office Building, Raleigh, N.C., before Joint Board No. 103, or, if the Joint Board waives its right to participate, before Examiner Laurence E. Masoner.

No. MC 31520 (Sub-No. 2), filed April 10, 1962. Applicant: SALVATORE SOLDANT, doing business as SOLDANT OF BOSTON, 362 Levin Road, Rockland, Mass. Applicant's representative: Gerard J. Donovan, 37 Leighton Road, Hyde Park 36, Mass. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *New upholstered furniture, uncrated, and damaged, defective and returned shipments of new upholstered furniture*, between Boston and Somerville, Mass., and points in New York on U.S. Highway 9-W between and including Newburgh, N.Y., and Albany, N.Y., Mount Kisco, N.Y., and points on U.S. Highway 9 between and including Poughkeepsie, N.Y., and Albany, N.Y.

HEARING: July 11, 1962, at the New Post Office and Court House Building, Boston, Mass., before Joint Board No. 191.

No. MC 42487 (Sub-No. 553), filed May 23, 1962. Applicant: CONSOLIDATED FREIGHTWAYS CORPORATION OF DELAWARE, 175 Linfield Drive, Menlo Park, Calif. Applicant's attorney: R. E. Poelman (same address as applicant). Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Molasses*, in bulk, (1) from points in California, Oregon, and Washington to points in Idaho, Utah, Montana, Wyoming, Colo-

rado, and Nevada, and (2) from points in Idaho and Utah to points in Montana, Wyoming, Colorado, Nevada, and Oregon.

NOTE: Applicant states it is a wholly owned subsidiary of Consolidated Freightways, Inc., a noncarrier, as is Missouri Consolidated Freightways Corporation (MC 52746), and, in addition, applicant owns all of the outstanding stock of New York Consolidated Freightways Corporation (MC 222). Applicant also owns all of the outstanding stock of Foster Freight Lines, Inc. (an Indiana intrastate carrier), Wheeler Transfer and Storage Company (a Wisconsin intrastate carrier), and Canadian Freightways, Ltd., a motor carrier operating in Canada.

HEARING: June 22, 1962, at the Utah Public Commission, Salt Lake City, Utah, before Examiner Donald R. Sutherland.

No. MC 45544 (Sub-No. 3), filed April 30, 1962. Applicant: SILVER LINE, INC., 196 Stanton Street, New York 2, N.Y. Applicant's representative: William D. Traub, 10 East 40th Street, New York 16, N.Y. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Materials and equipment used in the manufacture of wearing apparel, paper and paper containers used in the packing thereof, and wearing apparel*, between points in Carbon, Northampton, Lehigh, Monroe, Luzerne, Schuylkill, and Philadelphia Counties, Pa.

HEARING: July 16, 1962, in Room 300, U.S. Custom House Building, Second and Chestnut Streets, Philadelphia, Pa., before Examiner Joseph A. Reilly.

No. MC 46829 (Sub-No. 9), filed April 2, 1962. Applicant: ALLARD EXPRESS, INC., 806 Elm Street, Watertown, Wis. Applicant's attorney: Edward Solie, 1 South Pinckney Street, Madison 3, Wis. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over regular routes, transporting: *General commodities* (except those of unusual value, Classes A and B explosives, household goods as defined by the Commission, commodities in bulk, and those requiring special equipment), (1) between Waupun, Wis., and junction Wisconsin Highway 103 and U.S. Highway 151 (near Lamartine, Wis.); from Waupun over U.S. Highway 151 to junction Wisconsin Highway 103, and return over the same route, serving no intermediate points, but serving the junction Wisconsin Highway 103 and U.S. Highway 151 for joinder purposes only, as an alternate route for operating convenience only in connection with applicant's regular-route operations, (2) between Wyocena, Wis. and Montello, Wis.; from Wyocena over Wisconsin Highway 22 to Montello, and return over the same route, serving no intermediate points, as an alternate route for operating convenience only in connection with applicant's regular-route operations, (3) between Waterloo, Wis., and junction Wisconsin Highway 89 and Wisconsin Highway 33 (near Randolph, Wis.); from Waterloo over Wisconsin Highway 89 to junction Wisconsin Highway 33, and return over the same route, serving no intermediate points, as an alternate route for operating convenience only in connection with applicant's regular-route operations, (4)

between Oconomowoc, Wis., and junction U.S. Highway 16 and U.S. Highway 45; from Oconomowoc over U.S. Highway 16 to junction with U.S. Highway 45, and return over the same route, serving no intermediate points, but serving junction of U.S. Highway 16 and U.S. Highway 45 for joinder purposes only, as an alternate route for operating convenience only, in connection with applicant's regular-route operations between Chicago, Ill., and Oconomowoc, Wis., and (5) between junction Wisconsin Highway 67 and Wisconsin Highway 33 (south of Mayville, Wis.) and junction Wisconsin Highway 33 and U.S. Highway 45; from junction Wisconsin Highway 67 and Wisconsin Highway 33 over Wisconsin Highway 33 to junction U.S. Highway 45, and return over the same route, serving no intermediate points, but serving junction Wisconsin Highway 33 and U.S. Highway 45 for joinder purposes only, as an alternate route for operating convenience only in connection with applicant's regular-route operations between Chicago, Ill., and Mayville, Wis.

HEARING: July 19, 1962, at the Wisconsin Public Service Commission, Madison, Wis., before Joint Board No. 96.

No. MC 48958 (Sub-No. 58), filed March 26, 1962. Applicant: ILLINOIS-CALIFORNIA EXPRESS, INC., 510 East 51st Avenue, Denver, Colo. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over regular routes, transporting: *General commodities, including Classes A and B explosives*, but (excluding household goods as defined by the Commission, livestock, commodities in bulk, commodities of unusual value, those requiring special equipment, and those injurious or contaminating to other lading), between the junction of New Mexico Highway 83 and New Mexico Highway 529 at or near Loco Hills, N. Mex., and the junction of New Mexico Highway 8 and U.S. Highway 62, approximately fourteen miles west of Hobbs, N. Mex., from the junction of New Mexico Highway 83 and New Mexico Highway 529 over New Mexico Highway 529 to its junction with New Mexico Highway 8 thence over New Mexico Highway 8 to its junction with U.S. Highway 62 and return over the same route, serving no intermediate points, as an alternate route for operating convenience only in connection with other authorized routes.

HEARING: July 11, 1962, at the New Mexico State Corporation Commission, Santa Fe, N. Mex., before Joint Board No. 87, or, if the Joint Board waives its right to participate, before Examiner Henry A. Cockrum.

No. MC 48958 (Sub-No. 59), filed May 7, 1962. Applicant: ILLINOIS-CALIFORNIA EXPRESS, INC., 510 East 51st Avenue, Denver, Colo. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over regular routes, transporting: *General commodities*, including Classes A and B explosives, but excepting household goods as defined by the Commission, commodities in bulk, commodities of unusual value, those requiring special equipment, and those injuri-

ous or contaminating to other lading between Amarillo, Tex., and San Jon, N. Mex., as follows: From Amarillo over U.S. Highway 66 to San Jon and return over the same route, serving no intermediate points, but operating in connection with presently authorized routes and service.

HEARING: July 13, 1962, at the New Mexico State Corporation Commission, Santa Fe, N. Mex., before Joint Board No. 33, or, if the Joint Board waives its right to participate before Examiner Henry A. Cockrum.

No. MC 66129 (Sub-No. 3), filed April 27, 1962. Applicant: HUGHES BROS. TRANSPORTATION COMPANY, INC., 113 Metropolitan Avenue, Brooklyn, N.Y., Applicant's attorney: Arthur J. Piken, 160-16 Jamaica Avenue, Jamaica 32, N.Y. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Printing ink*, in bulk, in tank vehicles, from Lodi, N.J., to Providence, R.I., and *returned, refused and rejected shipments*, on return.

HEARING: July 12, 1962, at 346 Broadway, New York, N.Y., before Examiner W. Elliott Nefflen.

No. MC 69116 (Sub-No. 66), filed April 16, 1962. Applicant: SPECTOR FREIGHT SYSTEM, INC., 3100 South Wolcott Avenue, Chicago, Ill. Applicant's attorney: Davil Axelrod, 39 South LaSalle Street, Chicago 3, Ill. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over regular routes, transporting: *General commodities* (except Classes A and B explosives, livestock, household goods, as defined by the Commission, commodities in bulk, and those requiring special equipment), serving the site of the plant of Haloid Xerox, Inc., at Webster, N.Y., as an off-route point in connection with carrier's authorized regular route operations.

HEARING: July 19, 1962, at the Hotel Buffalo, Washington and Swan Streets, Buffalo, N.Y., before Examiner Lyle C. Farmer.

No. MC 69116 (Sub-No. 67), Filed May 21, 1962. Applicant: SPECTOR FREIGHT SYSTEM, INC., 3100 South Wolcott Avenue, Chicago 8, Ill. Applicant's attorney: David Axelrod, 39 South La Salle Street, Chicago 3, Ill. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over regular routes, transporting: *General commodities* (except those of unusual value, Classes A and B explosives, household goods as defined by the Commission, commodities in bulk, and those requiring special equipment), as alternate routes for operating convenience only, (1) between Hartford, Conn., and junction U.S. Highway 6 and U.S. Highway 9W; from Hartford over U.S. Highway 6 to junction U.S. Highway 9W, and return over the same route, serving no intermediate points, and serving the junction of U.S. Highway 6 and Connecticut Highway 25 as a point of joinder only, and (2) between Bridgeport, Conn., and junction Connecticut Highway 25 and U.S. Highway 6, from Bridgeport over Connecticut Highway 25 to junction U.S. Highway 6, and return over the same route, serving no intermediate points, and serving the

junction of U.S. Highway 6 and Connecticut Highway 25, as a point of joinder only.

HEARING: July 17, 1962, at the Hartford Statler Hilton, Hartford, Conn., before Examiner W. Elliott Nefflen.

No. MC 78786 (Sub-No. 241), filed April 24, 1962. Applicant: PACIFIC MOTOR TRUCKING COMPANY, a corporation, 110 Market Street, San Francisco 11, Calif. Applicant's attorney: John MacDonald Smith, 65 Market Street, San Francisco 5, Calif. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over regular routes, transporting: *General commodities* (except those of unusual value, those injurious or contaminating to other lading, commodities in bulk, and household goods as defined by the Commission), between El Paso, Tex., and Tucumcari, N. Mex.; from El Paso over U.S. Highway 54 to Tucumcari, and return over the same route, serving all intermediate points and off-route points within five (5) miles of the above route which are stations on the line of Southern Pacific Company. Service shall be subject to the following conditions: (1) Service shall be limited to that which is auxiliary to, or supplemental of, railroad service of Southern Pacific Company. (2) Carrier shall not transport shipments between El Paso, Tex., on the one hand, and, on the other, Tucumcari, N. Mex., or through both of said points. (3) Service is subject to such further conditions which the Commission may in the future impose to restrict carrier's operations to service which is auxiliary to, or supplemental of, railroad service.

NOTE: Applicant holds contract authority in MC 78787 and Subs thereunder. Applicant states it is a wholly owned subsidiary of Southern Pacific Company, a carrier by railroad.

HEARING: July 12, 1962, at the New Mexico State Corporation Commission, Santa Fe, N. Mex., before Joint Board No. 33, or, if the Joint Board waives its right to participate before Examiner Henry A. Cockrum.

No. MC 89529 (Sub-No. 10), filed April 5, 1962. Applicant: UNITED PARCEL SERVICE OF PENNSYLVANIA, INC., 2600 North Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa. Applicant's attorney: S. Harrison Kahn, 1110-14 Investment Building, Washington, D.C. Authority sought to operate as a *contract carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Such commodities as are sold by department stores and retail specialty shops*, between Camden and Cherry Hill, N.J., and points in Pennsylvania and Delaware, within 60 (sixty) miles of Camden, N.J.

NOTE: Applicant states it proposes to operate between department stores and retail specialty shops or warehouses thereof in Camden and Cherry Hill, N.J., and customers of said stores and shops in Pennsylvania and Delaware, within 60 miles of Camden, N.J. Applicant further states it is a wholly owned subsidiary of United Parcel Service of America, Inc., which also owns and controls United Parcel Service, Inc., New York, N.Y., United Parcel Service, Inc., Cincinnati, Ohio, and indirectly owns and controls United Parcel Service of Portland, Oreg.

HEARING: July 18, 1962, in Room 300, U.S. Custom House Building, Second and Chestnut Streets, Philadelphia, Pa., before Examiner Joseph A. Reilly.

No. MC 89684 (Sub-No. 39), filed April 23, 1962. Applicant: WYCOFF COMPANY, INC., 560 South Second Street, West, Salt Lake City, Utah. Applicant's attorney: Harry D. Pugsley, Continental Bank Building, Salt Lake City, Utah. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over regular routes, transporting: *General commodities*, in express service (excluding commodities in bulk, household goods and those requiring special equipment by reason of size or weight), (1) between Salt Lake City, Utah, and Preston, Idaho, over U.S. Highway 91, returning over the same route, serving all intermediate points; (2) between Salt Lake City, Utah, and the Thiokol Chemical Plant and Air Force Plant No. 78, located approximately 20 miles west of Corinne, Utah, over U.S. Highway 91 to Brigham City, Utah, and thence over Utah Highway 83 through Corinne to the said plant sites, returning over the same route, serving all intermediate points.

HEARING: July 25, 1962, at the Utah Public Service Commission, Salt Lake City, Utah, before Joint Board No. 258, or, if the Joint Board waives its right to participate before Examiner Henry A. Cockrum.

No. MC 93682 (Sub-No. 8), filed April 12, 1962. Applicant: COLE'S EXPRESS, a corporation, 76 Dutton Street, Bangor, Maine. Applicant's attorney: Francis E. Barrett, Jr., Professional Building, 25 Bryant Avenue, East Milton 86 (Boston), Mass. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over regular routes, transporting: *General commodities* (except Classes A and B explosives, household goods as defined in *Practices of Motor Carriers of Household Goods*, 17 M.C.C. 467, commodities in bulk, commodities requiring special equipment, and articles of unusual value); (1) Between Bangor, Maine, and Port of Entry on the International Boundary line between the United States and Canada at or near Calais, Maine, serving no intermediate points, restricted to international traffic; (a) from Bangor over Maine Highway 9 to junction U.S. Highway 1 at or near Baring, Maine, and thence over U.S. Highway 1 to Calais, and return over the same route, and (b) from Bangor over alternate U.S. Highway 1 to Ellsworth, Maine, thence over Maine Highway 182 to junction U.S. Highway 1 at or near Cherryfield, Maine, thence over U.S. Highway 1 to junction Maine Highway 191 at or near Machias, Maine, thence over Maine Highway 191 to junction U.S. Highway 1 at or near Baring, and thence over U.S. Highway 1 to Calais, and return over the same route. (2) Between Bangor, Maine, and Port of Entry on the International Boundary line between the United States and Canada at or near Vanceboro, Maine, restricted to international traffic, serving no intermediate points; (a) from Bangor over U.S. Highway 2 to Lincoln, Maine, and thence over Maine Highway 6 to Vanceboro, and return over

the same route, and (b) from Bangor over Maine Highway 9 to junction U.S. Highway 1 at or near Baring, Maine, thence over U.S. Highway 1 to junction Maine Highway 6 at or near Topsfield, Maine, thence over Maine Highway 6 to Vanceboro, and return over the same route.

NOTE: Applicant states it is currently operating W. J. Foley Trucking Co., MC-60907, pursuant to docket MC-F 7825.

HEARING: July 19, 1962, at The State House, Augusta, Maine, before Joint Board No. 115.

No. MC 93682 (Sub-No. 9), filed April 12, 1962. Applicant: COLE'S EXPRESS, a corporation, 76 Dutton Street, Bangor, Maine. Applicant's attorney: Francis E. Barrett, Jr., Professional Building, 25 Bryant Avenue, East Milton 86 (Boston), Mass. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over regular routes, transporting: *General commodities* (except Classes A and B explosives, household goods, as defined in *Practices of Motor Common Carriers of Household Goods*, 17 M.C.C. 467, commodities in bulk, commodities requiring special equipment, and articles of unusual value), between Portland, Maine, and Bangor, Maine; from Portland over U.S. Highway 1 to Brunswick, Maine, thence over U.S. Highway 201 to Waterville, Maine, through Augusta, Maine (also from Augusta over Maine Highway 11 to Waterville), thence over Maine Highway 11 to Newport, Maine, thence over U.S. Highway 2 to Bangor, and return over the same routes, serving all intermediate points.

NOTE: Applicant states it is currently operating W. J. Foley Trucking Co., MC-60907, pursuant to docket MC-F 7825.

HEARING: July 20, 1962, at The State House, Augusta, Maine, before Joint Board No. 70.

No. MC 95540 (Sub-No. 428), filed May 14, 1962. Applicant: WATKINS MOTOR LINES, INC., Albany Highway, Thomasville, Ga. Applicant's attorney: Joseph H. Blackshear, Gainesville, Ga. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Frozen foods*, from points in Minnesota, to points in Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Tennessee.

NOTE: Applicant states it is under common control with Arctic Express, Inc., through stock ownership in Bill Watkins and Watkins Motor Lines, Inc.

HEARING: July 10, 1962, at the Offices of the Interstate Commerce Commission, Washington, D.C., before Examiner Alton R. Smith.

No. MC 96485 (Sub-No. 4), filed April 11, 1962. Applicant: MELVIN J. ROBINSON, Colden, N.Y. Applicant's representative: Raymond A. Richards, 35 Curtice Park, P.O. Box 25, Webster, N.Y. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Alloys, alloy scrap, refractories, crucibles, grinding wheels, refractory cements and abrasive grains*, from Niagara Falls, N.Y., to Hamburg, N.Y.

HEARING: July 19, 1962, at the Hotel Buffalo, Washington and Swan Streets, Buffalo, N.Y., before Examiner Lyle C. Farmer.

No. MC 103493 (Sub-No. 5), filed April 3, 1962. Applicant: ROBINSON TRANSFER COMPANY, INC., 103 North Front Street, La Crosse, Wis. Applicant's attorney: Claude J. Jasper, Provident Building, 111 South Fairchild Street, Madison 3, Wis. Authority sought to operate as a *contract carrier*, by motor vehicle over irregular routes, transporting: *Merchandise such as is dealt in by wholesale, retail, and chain grocery and food business houses*, and in connection therewith, *equipment, materials and supplies* used in the conduct of such business, under a continuing contract with Gateway Grocery Co. of La Crosse, Wis., between La Crosse, Wis., on the one hand, and on the other points in Blackhawk, Buchanan, Butler, Cerro Cordo, Franklin, and Worth Counties, Iowa.

HEARING: July 24, 1962, at the Wisconsin Public Service Commission, Madison, Wis., before Joint Board No. 181.

No. MC 103993 (Sub-No. 163), filed May 16, 1962. Applicant: MORGAN DRIVE-AWAY, INC., 500 Equity Building, Elkhart, Ind., Applicant's attorney: John E. Lesow, 3737 North Meridian Street, Indianapolis 8, Ind. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: (1) *Trailers*, designed to be drawn by passenger automobiles, in initial movements in truckaway service, from points in Maine to points in the United States, including Alaska, but excluding Hawaii; (2) *campers and camper coaches*, designed for installation on pick-up trucks, in truckaway service, from points in Maine to points in the United States, including Alaska but excluding Hawaii; and (3) *empty containers or other such incidental facilities* (not specified) used in transporting the commodities specified in (1) and (2) above, on return.

HEARING: July 26, 1962, at the New Post Office and Court House Building, Boston, Mass., before Examiner W. Elliott Nefflen.

No. MC 107439 (Sub-No. 5), filed April 30, 1962. Applicant: C. C. BARNES AND C. C. SIMONSON, a partnership, doing business as THE BARNES TRUCK COMPANY, 101 South First Street, Riverton, Wyo. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over regular routes, transporting: *Petroleum coke*, in bulk, in tank vehicles, dry, from Billings and Laurel, Mont., to the site of Columbia Geneva Steel Mill located at or near Atlantic City, Wyo. (27 miles southwest of Lander, Wyo.); from Billings and Laurel over Interstate Highway 90 and U.S. Highway 10, thence over U.S. Highways 312 and 310 to Greybull, Wyo.; thence over U.S. Highway 20 to Shoshoni, Wyo., thence over U.S. Highway 26 and Wyoming Highway 789 to Lander, Wyo.; thence over U.S. Highway 287 and Wyoming Highway 28 to Atlantic City, Wyo., and return over the same route, serving no intermediate or off-route points.

HEARING: July 27, 1962, at the Wyoming Public Service Commission, Chey-

enne, Wyo., before Joint Board No. 123, or, if the Joint Board waives its right to participate before Examiner Henry A. Cockrum.

No. MC 107515 (Sub-No. 396), filed May 10, 1962. Applicant: REFRIGERATED TRANSPORT CO., INC., 290 University Avenue SW., Atlanta 10, Ga. Applicant's attorney: Paul M. Daniell, Grant Building, Atlanta 2, Ga. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Frozen foods* from points in Minnesota to points in Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, and Virginia, traversing the States of Iowa, Wisconsin, Illinois, and Indiana for operating convenience only.

NOTE: Applicant states that its president, owner of half its stock, holds contract carrier permits under MC-104589 and subs.

HEARING: July 10, 1962, at the Offices of the Interstate Commerce Commission, Washington, D.C., before Examiner Alton R. Smith.

No. MC 107839 (Sub-No. 42), filed January 25, 1962. Applicant: DENVER-ALBUQUERQUE MOTOR TRANSPORT, INC., 4716 Humboldt Street, Denver, Colo. Applicant's attorney: Marion F. Jones, 526 Denham Building, Denver 2, Colo. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: (a) *Meats, meat products, meat byproducts*, (b) *dairy products*, and (c) *articles distributed by meatpacking houses* as defined by the Commission in *Modification of Permits of Motor Contract Carriers of Packinghouse Products*, 46 M.C.C. 23, and (d) *frozen fruits, vegetables and fish* between Albuquerque, N. Mex., on the one hand, and, on the other, points in Arizona.

HEARING: July 9, 1962, at the New Mexico State Corporation Commission, Santa Fe, N. Mex., before Joint Board No. 129, or, if the Joint Board waives its right to participate before Examiner Henry A. Cockrum.

No. MC 108207 (Sub-No. 89), filed February 16, 1962. Applicant: FROZEN FOOD EXPRESS, 318 Cadiz Street, Dallas, Tex. Applicant's attorney: Ralph W. Pulley, Jr., First National Bank Building, Dallas, Tex. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Yeast*, from St. Louis, Mo., to Memphis, Tenn., and points in Mississippi and Louisiana.

HEARING: July 10, 1962, at the Pick-Mark Twain Hotel, St. Louis, Mo., before Examiner Samuel C. Shoup.

No. MC 108207 (Sub-No. 90), filed March 2, 1962. Applicant: FROZEN FOOD EXPRESS, INC., 318 Cadiz Street, Dallas, Tex. Applicant's attorney: Ralph W. Pulley, Jr., First National Bank Building, Dallas, Tex. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Frozen foods*, (1) from points in Minnesota and Iowa, to points in Kansas and Missouri, (2) from Frankfort, Mich., to points in Iowa.

HEARING: July 9, 1962, at the Pick-Mark Twain Hotel, St. Louis, Mo., before Examiner Samuel C. Shoup.

No. MC 108207 (Sub-No. 92), filed April 25, 1962. Applicant: FROZEN FOOD EXPRESS, a corporation, 318 Cadiz Street, Dallas, Tex. Applicant's attorney: Carl L. Phinney, First National Bank Building, Dallas 2, Tex. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Meats, meat products, meat byproducts*, and *articles distributed by meatpacking houses*, as defined by the Commission, in vehicles equipped with mechanical refrigeration, from Dodge City, Kans., to points in Minnesota, Wisconsin, Illinois, Michigan, and Indiana.

HEARING: July 19, 1962, at the Park East Hotel, Kansas City, Mo., before Examiner Samuel C. Shoup.

No. MC 108207 (Sub-No. 94), filed May 21, 1962. Applicant: FROZEN FOOD EXPRESS, 318 Cadiz Street, Dallas, Tex. Applicant's attorney: Leroy Hallman, First National Bank Building, Dallas 2, Tex. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Frozen foods*, from points in Minnesota to points in Alabama, Arkansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, Kansas, Texas, Oklahoma, Iowa, and Memphis, Tenn.

HEARING: July 10, 1962, at the Offices of the Interstate Commerce Commission, Washington, D.C., before Examiner Alton R. Smith.

No. MC 108428 (Sub-No. 9), filed April 30, 1962. Applicant: DINO D'AGATA, Northeast Corner 25th and Dickinson, Philadelphia 24, Pa. Applicant's representative: G. Donald Bullock, Box 103, Wyncote, Pa. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Malt beverages*, from Philadelphia, Pa., and points in Pennsylvania within twenty-five (25) miles of Philadelphia, to points in West Virginia, and *empty containers or other such incidental facilities* (not specified), used in transporting the commodities specified above, on return.

HEARING: July 17, 1962, in Room 300, U.S. Custom House Building, Second and Chestnut Streets, Philadelphia, Pa., before Examiner Joseph A. Reilly.

No. MC 108449 (Sub-No. 144), filed March 14, 1962. Applicant: INDIAN-HEAD TRUCK LINE, INC., 1947 West County Road "C", St. Paul 13, Minn. Applicant's attorney: Glenn W. Stephens, 121 West Doty Street, Madison 3, Wis. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Cement*, from points in the Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minn., Commercial Zone (as defined by the Commission), and points within 25 miles thereof, to points in Minnesota, Iowa, Wisconsin, North Dakota, South Dakota, and the Upper Peninsula of Michigan.

NOTE: Applicant states that Moore Motor Freight Lines, Inc., MC 17481, is a wholly owned subsidiary.

HEARING: July 12, 1962, at the Old Post Office Building, Public Square and Superior Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio, before Examiner James Anton.

No. MC 108586 (Sub-No. 54), filed April 26, 1962. Applicant: STEFFKE FREIGHT CO., a corporation, 3100 South Wolcott Avenue, Chicago 8, Ill. Applicant's attorney: David Axelrod, 39 South LaSalle Street, Chicago 3, Ill. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over regular routes, transporting: *General commodities* (except Classes A and B explosives, household goods as defined by the Commission, commodities in bulk, and those requiring special equipment) between Rock Island, Ill., and Peoria, Ill., as follows: From Rock Island over U.S. Highway 67 to junction with Illinois Highway 92, thence over Illinois Highway 92 to junction with U.S. Highway 150, thence over U.S. Highway 150 to Peoria, and return over the same route, serving no intermediate or off-route points.

NOTE: Applicant states that this operation will be restricted against the transportation of traffic originating at or destined to Peoria and points within its commercial zone. Applicant further states that it is a wholly owned subsidiary of Spector Freight System, Inc.

HEARING: July 18, 1962, at the Midland Hotel, 172 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill., before Joint Board No. 54.

No. MC 109708 (Sub-No. 21), filed April 19, 1962. Applicant: ERVIN J. KRAMER, doing business as MARYLAND TANK TRANSPORTATION CO., 401 Highland Street, Frederick, Md. Applicant's attorney: Wilmer B. Hill, Transportation Building, Washington 6, D.C. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: (A) *Grape juice and grape juice concentrate*, in bulk, in tank vehicles, (1) from Westfield, Hammondsport, and Clermont, N.Y., and points in Columbia, Dutchess, and Ulster Counties, N.Y., to points in Virginia, Maryland, Florida, and North Carolina, and Atlanta, Ga., Nashville, Tenn., and Birmingham, Ala., and (2) from Geneva, Ohio, to Hanover, Pa., and Baltimore, Md., and (B) *Wine*, in bulk, in tank vehicles, from Petersburg, Va., to Canandaigua, N.Y., and Baltimore, Md.

HEARING: July 11, 1962, at 346 Broadway, New York, N.Y., before Examiner W. Elliott Neffen.

No. MC 109847 (Sub-No. 7), filed May 3, 1962. Applicant: BOSS LINGO LINES, INC., 226 Ohio Street, Buffalo, N.Y. Applicant's attorney: Harold G. Hernly, 711 14th Street NW., Washington 5, D.C. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over regular routes, transporting: *General commodities* (except those of unusual value, Classes A and B explosives, household goods as defined by the Commission, commodities in bulk, and those requiring special equipment), between Binghamton, N.Y., and New York, N.Y., as follows: (1) from Binghamton over U.S. Highway 11 to Scranton, Pa., thence over U.S. Highway 611 to junction U.S. Highway 46 near Columbia, N.J., thence

over U.S. Highway 46 to Clifton, N.J., thence over New Jersey Highway 3 to junction U.S. Highway 1, thence over U.S. Highway 1 to New York, and return over the same route, serving no intermediate points. (2) From Binghamton over New York Highway 17 to the New York-New Jersey state line, near Suffern, N.Y., thence over New Jersey Highway 17 to junction New Jersey Highway 3, thence over New Jersey Highway 3 to junction U.S. Highway 1, thence over U.S. Highway 1 to New York, and return over the same route, serving no intermediate points.

NOTE: Applicant states that service over the above routes is proposed for operating convenience only in connection with applicant's otherwise authorized regular route operations but with service at Binghamton, N.Y., for joinder only, limited to the transportation of shipments originating at, delivered to, or interchanged at New York, N.Y., and all points within 25 miles of Newark, N.J., on the one hand, and, on the other, Jamestown and Olean, N.Y., and points on its authorized regular routes in Chautauqua, Cattaraugus, and Allegany Counties, N.Y., and Warren, McKean, and Potter Counties, Pa.

HEARING: July 20, 1962, at the Hotel Buffalo, Washington and Swan Streets, Buffalo, N.Y., before Examiner Lyle C. Farmer.

No. MC 110525 (Sub-No. 502), filed May 11, 1962. Applicant: CHEMICAL LEAMAN TANK LINES, INC., 520 East Lancaster Avenue, Downingtown, Pa. Applicant's attorney: Leonard A. Jaskiewicz, Munsey Building, Washington 4, D.C. Authority sought to operate as a common carrier, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Sodium chloride*, in bulk, from Akron, Ohio, to points in New York.

HEARING: July 12, 1962, at the Offices of the Interstate Commerce Commission, Washington, D.C., before Examiner Raymond V. Sar.

No. MC 110656 (Sub-No. 3), filed May 9, 1962. Applicant: PARKER MOTOR FREIGHT, INC., 128 Fulton Street, Petoskey, Mich. Applicant's attorney: Walter N. Bieneman, Guardian Building, Detroit 26, Mich. Authority sought to operate as a common carrier, by motor vehicle, over regular routes, transporting: *General commodities* (except those of unusual value, Classes A and B explosives, household goods as defined in *Practices of Motor Common Carriers of Household Goods*, 17 M.C.C. 467, commodities in bulk, and commodities requiring special equipment). (1) Between Cadillac over U.S. Highway 131 to junction with Michigan Highway 113, thence over Michigan Highway 113 to junction with Michigan Highway 37, thence over Michigan Highway 37 to junction with U.S. Highway 31, thence over U.S. Highway 31 to Petoskey, and return over the same route. (To substitute Michigan Highway 37 where existing authority incorrectly refers to Michigan Highway 42). (2) Between the junction of U.S. Highway 131 and Michigan Highway 186 to junction with Michigan Highway 113: From junction of U.S. Highway 131 and Michigan Highway 186, thence over Michigan Highway

186 to junction with Michigan Highway 113, and return over the same route. (To correct existing inaccurate description resulting from highway relocation and renumbering.) (3) Between Kalkaska and Acme, Mich.: From Kalkaska over Michigan Highway 72 to junction with U.S. Highway 31 at Acme, and return over the same route. (To substitute Michigan Highway 72 for incorrect reference to County Highway 612, and clarify route description.) (4) Between Ellsworth and Kewadin, Mich.: From Ellsworth over County Highway 593 through Central Lake and Alden to junction with U.S. Highway 31 at Kewadin, and return over the same route. (To combine and clarify two existing routes.) (5) Between Central Lake and junction with County Highway 593: From Central Lake over Michigan Highway 88 to Bellaire, thence over County Highway 620 to junction with County Highway 593, and return over the same route. (To redetermine present authority.)

NOTE: Applicant herein seeks changes in descriptions of certain authorized routes to correct existing inaccuracies. Authority is sought to serve all intermediate points on the above-described routes, and the off-route point of Rapid City, Mich.

HEARING: July 13, 1962, at the Federal Building, Lansing, Mich., before Joint Board No. 76.

No. MC 110884 (Sub-No. 5), filed May 14, 1962. Applicant: FRANCIS A. AUBREY, 240 Hillside Avenue, Cranford, N.J. Applicant's representative: George A. Olsen, 69 Tonnele Avenue, Jersey City, N.J. Authority sought to operate as a contract carrier, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: (1) *Electrical wiring plugs, receptacles, rosettes, sockets and parts thereof, electrical cord sets and fuse plugs*, in packages, from Farmingdale, N.Y., and New York, N.Y., to Chicago, Ill., Cincinnati, Ohio, Detroit, Mich., Philadelphia, and Pittsburgh, Pa.; and (2) *Steel junction boxes with or without interior fittings, including electrical switches, and rejected shipments*, from Farmingdale, N.Y., to Chicago, Ill., Cincinnati, Ohio, Detroit, Mich., Philadelphia, and Pittsburgh, Pa.

HEARING: July 12, 1962, at the Offices of the Interstate Commerce Commission, Washington, D.C., before Examiner Dallas B. Russell.

No. MC 111228 (Sub-No. 5), filed May 10, 1962. Applicant: JAMES F. DAVIS, doing business as DAVIS TRUCKING COMPANY, Pottsville Boulevard Box 464, Pottsville, Pa. Applicant's attorney: George W. Heffner, 501 West Market Street, Pottsville, Pa. Authority sought to operate as a common carrier, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: (1) *Scrap metal, cast iron*, in bulk, in dump vehicles, from Bronx, N.Y., to the site of the Leed Foundry, Inc., located at Pottsville, Pa., and (2) *broken glass*, in bulk, in dump vehicles, from Jersey City, N.J., to the plant site of the Maryland Glass Company located at Baltimore, Md.

HEARING: July 17, 1962, in Room 300, U.S. Custom House Building, Second and Chestnut Streets, Philadelphia, Pa., before Examiner Joseph A. Reilly.

No. MC 111383 (Sub-No. 12), filed May 21, 1962. Applicant: BRASWELL MOTOR FREIGHT LINES, INC., 301 Reynolds Street (P.O. Box 9518), El Paso, Tex. Applicant's attorney: T. S. Christopher, Continental Life Building, Fort Worth 2, Tex. Authority sought to operate as a common carrier, by motor vehicle, over regular routes, transporting: *General commodities* (except commodities of unusual value, Classes A and B explosives, household goods as defined by the Commission, commodities in bulk, and those requiring special equipment), (1) between Houston and Freeport, Tex., (a) from Houston, over Texas Highway 35 to its junction with Texas Highway 288, thence over Texas Highway 288 to Freeport, and return over the same route, serving no intermediate points, (b) from Houston, over Texas Highway 288 to Freeport, and return over the same route, serving no intermediate points, and (2) between Rosenberg and Freeport, Tex., from Rosenberg, over Texas Highway 36 to Freeport, and return over the same route, serving no intermediate points, with service at Rosenberg for the purpose of joinder of routes only, subject to the restriction that no traffic shall be transported over such route that moves from or to Rosenberg, Tex.

NOTE: Applicant proposes to coordinate service over the proposed route with service over its existing routes. Common control may be involved.

HEARING: June 14, 1962, at the Texas State Hotel, Houston, Tex., before Joint Board No. 77, or, if the Joint Board waives its right to participate before Examiner C. Evans Brooks.

No. MC 111981 (Sub-No. 8), filed May 4, 1962. Applicant: ROBIDEAU'S EXPRESS, INC., 460 Oregon Avenue, Philadelphia, Pa. Applicant's representative: Charles H. Trayford, 220 East 42d Street, New York 17, N.Y. Authority sought to operate as a common carrier, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Food and food products*, in vehicles equipped with mechanical refrigeration, from Doylestown and Philadelphia, Pa., Wilmington, Del., Hammonton, Braddock, and Glassboro, N.J., to points in New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, and the District of Columbia.

HEARING: July 19, 1962, in Room 300, U.S. Custom House Building, Second and Chestnut Streets, Philadelphia, Pa., before Examiner Joseph A. Reilly.

No. MC 112020 (Sub-No. 155), filed February 26, 1962. Applicant: COMMERCIAL OIL TRANSPORT, INC., 1030 Stayton Street, Fort Worth, Tex. Authority sought to operate as a common carrier, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Vegetable oils, animal fats, and products and blends thereof*, in bulk, in tank vehicles, (1) from points in the St. Louis, Mo., Commercial Zone to points in Alabama, Arkansas, Colorado, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, and Wisconsin, and (2) from points in Alabama, Arkansas, Colorado,

Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, and Wisconsin to points in the St. Louis, Mo., commercial zone.

NOTE: Applicant states that it is owned and controlled by the same stockholders who own and control Commercial Oil Transport of Oklahoma, Inc.

HEARING: July 17, 1962, at the Pick-Mark Twain Hotel, St. Louis, Mo., before Examiner Samuel C. Shoup.

No. MC 112590 (Sub-No. 5), filed April 30, 1962. Applicant: UNITED MOTOR FREIGHT, INC., 919 Call Street, Lansing, Mich. Applicant's attorney: Ronald R. Pentecost, 1400 Michigan National Tower, Lansing 8, Mich. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *General commodities* (except those of unusual value, Classes A and B explosives, household goods as defined by the Commission, commodities in bulk, and those requiring special equipment), between Owosso, Mich., and points within 8 miles thereof, on the one hand, and, on the other, Willow Run Airport, and Detroit Metropolitan Airport, Wayne County, Mich.

NOTE: Applicant states the proposed service shall be subject to the restriction that all traffic transported shall have immediately prior or immediately subsequent movement by air carrier, interstate.

HEARING: July 12, 1962, at the Federal Building, Lansing, Mich., before Joint Board No. 76.

No. MC 112617 (Sub-No. 109), filed February 26, 1962. Applicant: LIQUID TRANSPORTERS, INC., P.O. Box 5135, Cherokee Station, Louisville 5, Ky. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Corn syrup and blends thereof*, in bulk, from Louisville, Ky., to points in Arkansas, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Missouri, Ohio, Tennessee, Virginia, and West Virginia.

HEARING: July 18, 1962, at the Pick-Mark Twain Hotel, St. Louis, Mo., before Examiner Samuel C. Shoup.

No. MC 112750 (Sub-No. 95), filed March 12, 1962. Applicant: ARMORED CARRIER CORPORATION, DeBevoise Building, 222-17 Northern Boulevard, Bayside, N.Y. Applicant's attorney: Claude J. Jasper, 111 South Fairchild Street, Madison 3, Wis. Authority sought to operate as a *contract carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Commercial papers, documents and written instruments* (except coin, currency, bullion and negotiable securities) as are used in the conduct of the business of banks and banking institutions, between Chicago, Ill., on the one hand, and, on the other, points in Columbia, Dodge, Jefferson, Kenosha, and Walworth Counties, Wis.

NOTE: Applicant states "Arthur DeBevoise owns stock of applicant and also Carolin-Virginia Couriers Inc. (MC 123486), Southern Couriers Inc. (MC 123304) and Ohio Couriers, Inc. (MC 124088)".

HEARING: July 23, 1962, at the Wisconsin Public Service Commission, Madison, Wis., before Joint Board 17.

No. MC 113267 (Sub-No. 61), filed February 26, 1962. Applicant: CENTRAL & SOUTHERN TRUCK LINES, INC., 312 West Morris Street, Caseyville, Ill. Applicant's representative: Frederick H. Figge (same address as applicant). Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Meats, meat products, meat byproducts, dairy products, articles distributed by meatpacking houses, those commodities used by meatpackers in the conduct of their business when destined to and for use by meatpackers*, in vehicles equipped with mechanically temperature controlled refrigeration, from Wichita, Kans., to Shreveport, La.

NOTE: Applicant states that its officers are officers and stockholders in the following motor carriers of passengers their baggage, and express: Industrial Bus Lines, Inc., MC 114168, Vandalia Bus Line, Inc., MC 2698. In addition thereto Oliver and Kathryn Anderson are officers and stockholders in Caseyville Bus Lines, Inc., MC 110845.

HEARING: July 11, 1962, at the Pick-Mark Twain Hotel, St. Louis, Mo., before Examiner Samuel C. Shoup.

No. MC 113267 (Sub-No. 62), filed March 16, 1962. Applicant: CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN TRUCK LINES, INC., 312 West Morris St., Caseyville, Ill. Applicant's representative: Fred H. Figge (same address as applicant). Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Frozen and prepared foods*, from O'Fallon and National Stockyards (corporate and RR name National City, St. Clair County), Ill., and St. Louis, Mo., to points in Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oklahoma, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, West Virginia, and Wisconsin.

NOTE: Common control may be involved.

HEARING: July 12, 1962, at the Pick-Mark Twain Hotel, St. Louis, Mo., before Examiner Samuel C. Shoup.

No. MC 113267 (Sub-No. 63), filed March 19, 1962. Applicant: CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN TRUCK LINES, INC., 312 West Morris Street, Caseyville, Ill. Applicant's representative: Fred H. Figge, 312 West Morris Street, Caseyville, Ill. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Canned and preserved foods* from Mount Summit and Shirley, Ind. to points in Iowa and Nebraska.

NOTE: Applicant states that its officers are stockholders and officers in Industrial Bus Lines, Inc., and Vandalia Bus Line, Inc., and that Oliver and Kathryn Anderson, its president and secretary-treasurer, are officers and stockholders in Caseyville Bus Lines, Inc.

HEARING: July 13, 1962, at the Pick-Mark Twain Hotel, St. Louis, Mo., before Examiner Samuel C. Shoup.

No. MC 113362 (Sub-No. 13), filed April 26, 1962. Applicant: ELLSWORTH FREIGHT LINES, INC., 220 East Broadway, Eagle Grove, Iowa. Applicant's attorney: Stephen Robinson, 412 Equitable Building, Des Moines 9, Iowa. Authority

sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: (1) *Petroleum and petroleum products*, as described in Appendix XIII to the report in *Descriptions in Motor Carrier Certificates*, 61 M.C.C. 209, in packages and containers other than bulk, and (2) *lubricating grease*, in packages and containers other than bulk, from Bradford, Franklin, Rouseville, Reno, and Oil City, Pa., to points in Iowa, Minnesota, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, Wisconsin, Kansas, and Missouri.

HEARING: July 18, 1962, at the Hotel Buffalo, Washington and Swan Streets, Buffalo, N.Y., before Examiner Lyle C. Farmer.

No. MC 113495 (Sub-No. 7), filed March 13, 1962. Applicant: GREGORY HEAVY HAULERS, INC., 2 Main Street, Nashville, Tenn. Applicant's attorney: Wilmer B. Hill, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Calcium chloride*, in bags, from Ludington and Midland, Mich., to points in Tennessee, Virginia, and West Virginia.

HEARING: July 17, 1962, at the Detroit-Leland Hotel, Detroit, Mich., before Examiner James Anton.

No. MC 113509 (Sub-No. 2), filed April 23, 1962. Applicant: DANTE GENTILINI TRUCKING, INC., 1636 West 125th Street, Chicago, Ill. Applicant's attorney: Bernard G. Colby, 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago 2, Ill. Authority sought to operate as a *contract carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Vermiculite, aluminum siding, insulating material, and plaster*, from the site of the Zonolite Company plant in Calumet Township, Cook County, Ill., to points in southeastern Michigan, on, south, and west of a line beginning with the western terminus of Michigan Highway 20 near Lake Michigan, north of the city of Muskegon, thence east over Michigan Highway 20 to the intersection of U.S. Highway 31, north of the city of Muskegon, thence over U.S. Highway 31, to the intersection of U.S. Highway 31 and U.S. Highway 16 southeast of the city of Muskegon, thence east over U.S. Highway 16 to the intersection of U.S. Highway 16 and Michigan Highway 66, thence south over Michigan Highway 66 to the intersection of Michigan Highway 66 and Michigan Highway 78, thence south over Michigan Highway 78 to the intersection of Michigan Highway 78 and U.S. Highway 12, thence east over U.S. Highway 12 to the intersection of U.S. Highway 12 and U.S. Highway 27, thence south over U.S. Highway 27 to the Indiana-Michigan State line, thence west along the Indiana-Michigan State line to Lake Michigan, thence north along the western boundary of Lake Michigan to point of origin, and *rejected shipments*, on return. RESTRICTION: Applicant states the proposed operations will be limited to a transportation service to be performed under a continuing contract or contracts with the Zonolite Company.

HEARING: July 17, 1962, at the Midland Hotel, 172 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill., before Joint Board No. 73.

No. MC 113828 (Sub-No. 11), Filed April 2, 1962. Applicant: O'BOYLE TANK LINES, INCORPORATED, Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va. Applicant's attorney: Dale C. Dillon, 1835 Jefferson Place NW., Washington 6, D.C. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Dry cement*, in bulk and in bags, from Winston-Salem, N.C., to points in South Carolina.

NOTE: Common control may be involved.

HEARING: July 12, 1962, at the U.S. Court Rooms, Uptown Post Office Building, Raleigh, N.C., before Joint Board No. 2, or if, the Joint Board waives its right to participate, before Examiner Laurence E. Masoner.

No. MC 113843 (Sub-No. 46), filed May 7, 1962. Applicant: REFRIGERATED FOOD EXPRESS, INC., 316 Summer Street, Boston, Mass. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Frozen foods, and essence of fruit or berries*, from points in New York located on and west of a line beginning at Oswego, N.Y., and extending along New York Highway 57, to Syracuse, N.Y., and thence along U.S. Highway 11 to the New York-Pennsylvania State line, to points in Delaware, Kentucky, Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia, and West Virginia, and returned, rejected and refused shipments of commodities specified above, on return.

NOTE: Common control may be involved.

HEARING: July 17, 1962, at the Federal Building, Syracuse, N.Y., before Examiner Lyle C. Farmer.

No. MC 113843 (Sub-No. 47), filed May 11, 1962. Applicant: REFRIGERATED FOOD EXPRESS, INC., 316 Summer Street, Boston, Mass. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Foods and foodstuffs*, from points in Maine (except points in Aroostook County), to points in New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, Michigan, Illinois, Wisconsin, Missouri, Iowa, Minnesota, Nebraska, Kansas, Oklahoma, Colorado, and Baltimore, Md., and Washington, D.C., Commercial Zone, and returned, rejected, and refused shipments of the commodities specified above, on return.

NOTE: Common control may be involved.

HEARING: July 25, 1962, at the New Post Office and Court House Building, Boston, Mass., before Examiner W. Elliott Nefflen.

No. MC 113843 (Sub-No. 48), filed May 28, 1962. Applicant: REFRIGERATED FOOD EXPRESS, INC., 316 Summer Street, Boston, Mass. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Food and foodstuffs*, frozen or unfrozen, from Lake City, Pittsburgh, and Saltsburg, Pa., to points in Alabama, Arkansas, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Mississippi, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, North

Carolina, Ohio, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, West Virginia, and the District of Columbia, and returned, rejected and refused shipments of the above-specified commodities, on return.

HEARING: June 27, 1962, at the Offices of the Interstate Commerce Commission, Washington, D.C., before Examiner Henry C. Darmstadter.

No. MC 113843 (Sub-No. 49), filed May 31, 1962. Applicant: REFRIGERATED FOOD EXPRESS, INC., 316 Summer Street, Boston, Mass. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Frozen foods*, from Elmira, N.Y., to points in Indiana, Illinois, Maryland, Michigan, Missouri, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Virginia, and the District of Columbia, and returned, rejected and refused shipments of the above-specified commodities, on return.

NOTE: Common control may be involved.

HEARING: June 13, 1962, at the Offices of the Interstate Commerce Commission, Washington, D.C., before Examiner Samuel C. Shoup.

No. MC 114045 (Sub-No. 87), filed April 25, 1962. Applicant: TRANSCOLD EXPRESS, INC., P.O. Box 5842, Dallas, Tex. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: (1) *Dairy products*, as defined by the Commission in *Descriptions in Motor Carrier Certificates*, Appendix I, 61 M.C.C. 209, and (2) *commodities exempt from regulation*, under section 203(b)(6) of the Interstate Commerce Act, when moving in the same vehicle as the same time with dairy products, as defined by the Commission in *Descriptions in Motor Carrier Certificates*, Appendix I, 61 M.C.C. 209, from points in Missouri, Kansas, Oklahoma, and Arkansas, to points in Washington, Oregon, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Utah, and Wyoming, and (3) *empty containers or other such incidental facilities* (not specified), used in transporting the commodities specified above, and exempt commodities, on return trips.

HEARING: July 20, 1962, at the Park East Hotel, Kansas City, Mo., before Examiner Samuel C. Shoup.

No. MC 114364 (Sub-No. 63), filed April 19, 1962. Applicant: WRIGHT MOTOR LINES, INC., 16th and Elm Streets, Rocky Ford, Colo. Applicant's attorney: Marion F. Jones, 526 Denham Building, Denver 2, Colo. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: (1) *Dried beet pulp pellets*, from Bayard, Gering, Mitchell, and Scottsbluff, Nebr., Brighton, Eaton, Fort Collins, Fort Morgan, Greeley, Johnstown, Longmont, Loveland, Ovid, Sterling, Windsor, Ordway, Rocky Ford, Sugar City, and Brush, Colo., to points in Arizona and Blythe, Calif., and (2) *cottonseed cake products*, from points in Arizona and El Paso, Tex., to points in Colorado and Wyoming (except El Paso, Tex., to Wyoming).

NOTE: Applicant states it is controlled by Earl Bray, Inc. (Docket No. MC-F-0984).

HEARING: July 16, 1962, at the New Customs House, Denver, Colo., before Examiner Henry A. Cockrum.

No. MC 114457 (Sub-No. 7), filed March 16, 1962. Applicant: DART TRANSIT COMPANY, a corporation, 780 North Prior Avenue, St. Paul 4, Minn. Applicant's attorney: Charles W. Singer, 33 North LaSalle Street, Suite 3600, Chicago 2, Ill. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Frozen foods*, from Macon, Marshall, Carrollton, Moberly, and Milan, Mo., to Fargo, N. Dak., and points in Missouri.

HEARING: July 16, 1962, at the Pick-Mark Twain Hotel, St. Louis, Mo., before Examiner Samuel C. Shoup.

No. MC 115523 (Sub-No. 97), filed March 26, 1962. Applicant: CLARK TANK LINES COMPANY, a corporation, 1450 Beck Street, Salt Lake City, Utah. Applicant's attorneys: Marshall G. Berol and Edward M. Berol, 100 Bush Street, 21st Floor, San Francisco 4, Calif. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Dry fertilizer, dry fertilizer ingredients, and dry fertilizer compounds*, (a) from points in Bonneville, Power, and Minidoka Counties, Idaho, to points in Montana and Wyoming; (b) between points in Malheur, Harney, and Baker Counties, Oreg., and points in Owyhee, Canyon, Ada, Gem, Payette, Washington, Power, and Adams Counties, Idaho; (c) from points in Utah to points in Colorado, New Mexico, Arizona, California, and Nevada; (d) between points in Utah and Colorado; and (e) from points in California to points in Idaho, Utah, Nevada, and Oregon.

HEARING: July 24, 1962, at the Utah Public Service Commission, Salt Lake City, Utah, before Examiner Henry A. Cockrum.

No. MC 115523 (Sub-No. 98), filed March 26, 1962. Applicant: CLARK TANK LINES COMPANY, a corporation, 1450 Beck Street, Salt Lake City, Utah. Applicant's attorney: Marshall G. Berol, 100 Bush Street, San Francisco 4, Calif. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Beet pulp and beet pulp pellets* (a) between points in Oregon and Idaho; and (b) from points in Oregon, Idaho, Utah, Washington, and South Dakota to points in Utah, Idaho, Wyoming, Montana, Washington, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, California, Arizona, New Mexico, Texas, and Nevada.

HEARING: July 23, 1962, at the Utah Public Service Commission, Salt Lake City, Utah, before Examiner Henry A. Cockrum.

No. MC 115668 (Sub-No. 3), filed April 23, 1962. Applicant: WARREN G. HARDING, Box 394, East Albion Street, Avilla, Ind. Applicant's attorney: Ferdinand Born, Chamber of Commerce Building, Indianapolis, Ind. Authority sought to operate as a *contract carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Handi-pie (a small packaged pie)* from Detroit, Mich., to Chicago, Ill., and

only empty containers or such other incidental facilities (not specified) used in transporting the above commodity, on return trips.

HEARING: July 17, 1962, at the Midland Hotel, 172 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill., before Joint Board No. 73.

No. MC 116144 (Sub-No. 11), filed April 3, 1962. Applicant: **ARTHER W. SORENSEN**, doing business as **SORENSEN TRANSPORTATION COMPANY**, Amity Street, Bethany, Conn. Applicant's attorney: Hugh M. Joseloff, 410 Asylum Street, Hartford 3, Conn. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Fertilizer*, in bags, (1) from Cambridge, Mass., to points in Connecticut (except Bridgeport and Torrington, Conn.), (2) from North Weymouth, Mass., to points in Connecticut (except points in Tolland County and Bridgeport and Torrington, Conn.), and (3) from Carteret, N.J., to points in Connecticut, and points in Berkshire and Hampden Counties, Mass. (except Bridgeport and Torrington, Conn.).

NOTE: The purpose of proposed service is to remove the restriction on present authority against serving incorporated cities and boroughs in Connecticut (except with respect to Bridgeport and Torrington against which there is no restriction).

HEARING: July 16, 1962, at the Hartford Statler Hilton, Hartford, Conn., before Examiner W. Elliott Nefflen.

No. MC 116434 (Sub-No. 19), filed January 12, 1962. Applicant: **HUGH MAJOR**, 150 Sinclair, South Roxana, Ill. Applicant's attorney: David Axelrod, 39 South La Salle Street, Chicago 3, Ill. Authority sought to operate as a *contract carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Water well casing, pipe, tubing, pipe fittings and protectors, and steel*, between points in Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kansas, Louisiana, Maryland, Michigan, Mississippi, New Jersey, New York, North Dakota, South Dakota, North Carolina, South Carolina, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Texas, Virginia, and West Virginia, on the one hand, and, on the other, Sparta, Carlinville, Centralia, Cairo, Irvington, and Olney, Ill., and Louisiana, Mo.

HEARING: July 9, 1962, at the Midland Hotel, Chicago, Ill., before Examiner Leo M. Pellerzi.

No. MC 116527 (Sub-No. 2), filed January 24, 1962. Applicant: **E. J. MILLER**, Box 145, New Milford, Ohio. Applicant's attorney: Charles R. Iden, 500 First National Tower, Akron 8, Ohio. Authority sought to operate as a *contract carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: (1) *Precast concrete roof and floor slabs, concrete columns, beams, cribbing, pipe, blocks, steel headers and other miscellaneous articles required for the manufacture, support, unloading and erection of structures*, (a) from Kent, Ohio, to points in the lower peninsula of Michigan, Indiana, and Kentucky, and (b) from Livonia, Mich., to points in Ohio; and (2) *construction materials and damaged items* on return to either of the above points of origin.

NOTE: Applicant advises that the destination points are construction sites.

HEARING: July 11, 1962, at the Old Post Office Building, Public Square and Superior Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio, before Examiner James Anton.

No. MC 117119 (Sub-No. 53), filed May 10, 1962. Applicant: **WILLIS SHAW FROZEN EXPRESS, INC.**, Elm Springs, Ark. Applicant's attorneys: John H. Joyce, 26 North College, Fayetteville, Ark., and A. Alvis Layne, Pennsylvania Building, Washington 4, D.C. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Frozen foods*, from points in Minnesota to points in Alabama, Arkansas, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, Oklahoma, Texas, Illinois, Tennessee, and Nebraska.

HEARING: July 10, 1962, at the Offices of the Interstate Commerce Commission, Washington, D.C., before Examiner Alton R. Smith.

No. MC 117816 (Sub-No. 1), filed April 2, 1962. Applicant: **NORTHEASTERN-MALDEN BARREL CO., INC.**, 104 Suffolk Street, Malden, Mass. Applicant's attorney: Edward L. Hefron, 7 Water Street, Boston 9, Mass. Authority sought to operate as a *contract carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *New empty steel barrels, drums and containers*, from Jersey City, N.J., to points in Vermont, New Hampshire, and Maine.

HEARING: July 23, 1962, at the New Post Office and Court House Building, Boston, Mass., before Examiner W. Elliott Nefflen.

No. MC 118115 (Sub-No. 1), filed February 15, 1962. Applicant: **VIRGIL M. JENKINS**, doing business as **JENKINS TRUCK LINE**, 1815 Jackson, Kansas City, Mo. Applicant's attorney: Tom B. Kretsinger, 510 Professional Building, Kansas City 6, Mo. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Frozen foods and food products*, (A) from points in California, Idaho, Utah, Oregon, and Washington, to points in Arkansas, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, Nebraska, and Oklahoma, and (B) from points in Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, Minnesota, Nebraska, and South Dakota, to points in California, Idaho, Oregon, and Washington.

HEARING: July 23, 1962, at Park East Hotel, Kansas City, Mo., before Examiner Samuel C. Shoup.

No. MC 118721 (Sub-No. 2), filed April 9, 1962. Applicant: **WILLIAM McSPIRIT**, Hurley, N.Y. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Scrap metal*, from Kingston, N.Y., to points in New Jersey.

HEARING: July 9, 1962, at the Federal Building, Albany, N.Y., before Examiner Lyle C. Farmer.

No. MC 119164 (Sub-No. 13), filed April 20, 1962. Applicant: **J-E-M TRANSPORTATION CO., INC.**, Box 444, Middletown, N.Y. Applicant's representative: Charles H. Trayford, 220 East 42d Street, New York 17, N.Y. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Limestone*, in bulk, (1) from Canaan,

Conn., to Brooklyn, N.Y., and (2) from Newton, N.J., to Brooklyn, N.Y.

NOTE: Applicant states there is common control with J. Everitt Morley (MC 102232).

HEARING: July 10, 1962, at 346 Broadway, New York, N.Y., before Examiner W. Elliott Nefflen.

No. MC 119502 (Sub-No. 1), filed May 4, 1962. Applicant: **UNITED TRANSPORT LINES, INC.**, 71 Elm Street, Westfield, Mass. Applicant's representative: William L. Mobley, Rooms 311-315, 1694 Main Street, Springfield 3, Mass. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Fuel oil*, in bulk, in tank vehicle, from Springfield, Mass., to points in New Hampshire and Vermont on and south of U.S. Highway 4.

HEARING: July 17, 1962, at The Hartford Statler Hilton, Hartford, Conn., before Examiner W. Elliott Nefflen.

No. MC 119531 (Sub-No. 13), filed January 8, 1962. Applicant: **DIECKBRODER EXPRESS, INC.**, 5391 Eastern Avenue, Cincinnati 26, Ohio. Applicant's attorney: Charles W. Singer, 33 North La Salle Street, Chicago 2, Ill. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Pulpboard boxes*, from the plant site of the Container Corporation of America at or near the village of Carol Stream, Du Page County, Ill., to points in Indiana, Michigan, and Ohio.

HEARING: July 12, 1962, at the Midland Hotel, Chicago, Ill., before Examiner Leo M. Pellerzi.

No. MC 119543 (Sub-No. 1), filed May 14, 1962. Applicant: **HENRY N. LANCIANI**, Leominster Road, Sterling, Mass. Mailing address: R.F.D. Leominster, Mass. Applicant's representative: Arthur A. Wentzell, 539 Hartford Turnpike, Shrewsbury, Mass. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Coke*, in bulk, in dump trucks, from New Haven, Conn., to Athol, West Concord, Charlton Depot, Orange, and Graniteville (Westford), Mass.

NOTE: Applicant states the proposed operation will be limited to truckload shipments, only.

HEARING: July 12, 1962, at the New Post Office and Court House Building, Boston, Mass., before Joint Board No. 22.

No. MC 119641 (Sub-No. 35), filed April 20, 1962. Applicant: **RINGLE EXPRESS, INC.**, 405 South Grant Avenue, Flower, Ind. Applicant's attorney: Robert C. Smith, 912 Illinois Building, Indianapolis 4, Ind. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Agricultural implements*, from points in Wisconsin, to ports of entry on the International Boundary Line between the United States and Canada, at or near Port Huron and Detroit, Mich., and *damaged and rejected shipments*, on return.

NOTE: Applicant states proposed service will be restricted to traffic moving to points in Canada.

HEARING: July 11, 1962, at the Federal Building, Lansing, Mich., before Joint Board 95.

No. MC 119710 (Sub-No. 3), filed April 12, 1962. Applicant: JOHN L. SHUPE AND IVAN D. SHUPE, a partnership, doing business as SHUPE BROS., P.O. Box 919, Greeley, Colo. Applicant's attorney: Paul F. Sullivan, Sundial House—1821 Jefferson Place NW., Washington 6, D.C. Authority sought to operate as a *contract carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Salt and salt products*, and *pepper* in mixed shipments with salt, from Saltair, Utah, to points in South Dakota on and west of U.S. Highway 83, points in Wyoming north of a line starting at the Wyoming-Nebraska State line and proceeding along U.S. Highway 20 to Shoshoni, Wyo., thence north on said U.S. Highway 20 to Thermopolis, Wyo., then northwest on Wyoming Highway 120 to junction of Wyoming Highway 120 and U.S. Highway 20 near Cody, Wyo., thence over U.S. Highway 20 to Cody, Wyo., thence northeast over Wyoming Highway 14 to Garland, Wyo., thence north on Wyoming Highway 114 to Deaver, Wyo., thence north on U.S. Highway 310 to the Montana-Wyoming border, to points in Colorado south of U.S. Highway 50, and to points in Kansas on and west of U.S. Highway 83.

NOTE: Applicants states it proposes to transport exempt agricultural commodities, on return. Applicant further states the proposed operation will be performed under contract with the Morton Salt Company.

HEARING: July 16, 1962, at the New Customs House, Denver, Colo., before Examiner Henry A. Cockrum.

No. MC 119974 (Sub-No. 3) (SECOND AMENDMENT), filed October 20, 1962, published FEDERAL REGISTER issue of May 9, 1962, amended May 14, 1962, and republished, as amended, May 23, 1962, and further amended May 22, 1962, and republished, as further amended, this issue. Applicant: L. C. L. TRANSIT COMPANY, a corporation, 520 North Roosevelt Street, Green Bay, Wis. Applicant's attorney: Edward Solie, 1 South Pinckney Street, Madison 3, Wis. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Meat, meat products and meat byproducts, dairy products, and articles distributed by meat-packing houses*, as described in sections A, B, and C of Appendix I to the report in *Descriptions in Motor Carrier Certificates*, 61 M.C.C. 209, and 766, and *packinghouse supplies*, (1) between Albert Lea, Minn., and Cedar Rapids, Iowa, on the one hand, and, on the other, points in that part of Wisconsin north of a line beginning at Marinette, Wis., and extending along Wisconsin Highway 64 to Merrill, Wis., thence along U.S. Highway 51 to Wausau, Wis., thence along Wisconsin Highway 29 to junction U.S. Highway 12, near Elk Mound, Wis., and thence along U.S. Highway 12 to the Wisconsin-Minnesota state line, (2) between Rochelle, Ill., on the one hand, and, on the other, points in that part of Wisconsin in the Wisconsin territory described immediately above, and those in St. Croix, Dunn, Chippewa, Eau Claire, Pepin, Pierce, Buffalo, Trempealeau, Jackson, La Crosse, and Monroe Counties, Wis., and (3) between South

St. Paul, Minn., on the one hand, and, on the other, points in that part of Wisconsin west of a line beginning at La Crosse, Wis., thence along U.S. Highway 53 to Cameron, Wis., and north of a line beginning at Cameron, Wis., and extending along U.S. Highway 8 to the Wisconsin-Michigan State line.

NOTE: This second proposed amendment seeks to add South St. Paul, Minn., as an additional service point and avoid duplication of operating rights now held by applicant.

HEARING: Remains as assigned June 26, 1962, at the Wisconsin Public Service Commission, Madison, Wis., before Examiner Abraham J. Essrick.

No. MC 123242 (Sub-No. 6), filed March 19, 1962. Applicant: MISSOURI LUMBER TRANSPORTS, INC., P.O. Box 231, Arcadia, Mo. Applicant's attorney: Joseph R. Nacy, 117 West High Street, Jefferson City, Mo. Authority sought to operate as a *contract carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Lumber, wooden pallets, pallet materials and charcoal*, from points in Missouri, on, east and south of a line beginning at the Missouri-Arkansas State line, near Gainesville, Mo., and extending along Missouri Highway 5 to junction U.S. Highway 66 near Lebanon, Mo., thence along U.S. Highway 66 to the Missouri-Illinois State line at the Mississippi River, to Louisville, Ky., Milwaukee, Wis., and points in Illinois, Indiana, and Ohio.

NOTE: Applicant states "Commodities exempt from Commission Regulation under Sec. 203(b)(6), Interstate Commerce Act," will be transported, on return.

HEARING: July 12, 1962, at the Pick-Mark Twain Hotel, St. Louis, Mo., before Examiner Samuel C. Shoup.

No. MC 123511 (Sub-No. 3), filed May 3, 1962. Applicant: GRINGERI BROS. TRANSPORTATION CO., INC., 10 Baskin Road, Lexington, Mass. Applicant's attorney: Jeanne M. Hession, 64 Harvest Street, Dorchester, Mass. Authority sought to operate as a *contract carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: (1) *Mattresses, bedding, children's car beds and car seats*, from Newton, Mass., to points in Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, and Philadelphia, Pa., Baltimore, Md., and Washington, D.C., (2) *foam rubber, padding, and raw materials* dealt in and used in connection with the manufacture of the foregoing, from points in New York and New Jersey, to Newton, Mass., and (3) *refused and rejected shipments* of the commodities specified in (1) and (2) above, on return.

HEARING: July 24, 1962, at the New Post Office and Court House Building, Boston, Mass., before Examiner W. Elliott Nefflen.

No. MC 124188, filed February 5, 1962. Applicant: DAVID S. WRIGHT, doing business as D. S. WRIGHT, Depot Road, Hollis, N.H. Applicant's attorney: Kenneth F. McLaughlin, 27 Elm Street, Nashua, N.H. Authority sought to operate as a *contract carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: (1) *Lime* (quick and hydrated), in bags

and in bulk, including mixtures thereof with sand and cement, in bags and in bulk, of packaged sand, in bags, and of packaged asphalt patching mix, in bags, and of limestone, limestone products and limestone byproducts, in bags and in bulk, from Lee, West Stockbridge, and North Adams, Mass., to points in New Hampshire; and (2) *fertilizer and fertilizer products* from Cambridge, Weymouth, and Lowell, Mass., to points in New Hampshire.

HEARING: July 27, 1962, at the New Hampshire Public Service Commission, Concord, N.H., before Joint Board No. 189.

No. MC 124261 (AMENDMENT), filed March 8, 1962, published in the FEDERAL REGISTER issue of April 11, 1962, republished this issue as amended May 15, 1962. Applicant: R. & O. DELIVERY, INC., 509 West 52d Street, New York, N.Y. Applicant's attorney: Arthur J. Piken, 160-16 Jamaica Avenue, Jamaica 32, N.Y. Authority sought to operate as a *contract carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Books, files, interoffice correspondence and memoranda, advertising matter used in connection therewith, and empty containers or other such incidental facilities* (not specified) used in transporting the stated commodities, between Saddle Brook, N.J., on the one hand, and on the other, New York, N.Y.

NOTE: The purpose of this republication is to change the operation from a "from and to" service to a "between" service.

HEARING: July 23, 1962, at 346 Broadway, New York, N.Y., before Examiner Joseph A. Reilly.

No. MC 124268, filed March 12, 1962. Applicant: ROLAND T. ARBO, doing business as ARBO'S GARAGE, Haviland Street, Waterville, Maine. Authority sought to operate as a *contract carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Disabled, collision-damaged, and repossessed motor vehicles*, by use of a wrecker, from points in Maine to points in Massachusetts and New Hampshire.

HEARING: July 18, 1962, at The State House, Augusta, Maine, before Joint Board No. 69.

No. MC 124269, filed March 9, 1962. Applicant: ROBERT J. DOLLARD, doing business as DOLLARD TRUCKING, Dana Street, P.O. Box 489, Sheridan, Wyo. Authority sought to operate as a *contract carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: (1) *Bulk cement*, in special dump trailers, and (2) *sack cement*, between Rapid City, S. Dak., and points in Sheridan County, Wyo.

HEARING: July 27, 1962, at the Wyoming Public Service Commission, Cheyenne, Wyo., before Joint Board No. 183, or, if the Joint Board waives its right to participate before Examiner Henry A. Cockrum.

No. MC 124292, filed March 22, 1962. Applicant: COWAN AND SHAIN, INC., 14 Stevens Street, Haverhill, Mass. Applicant's attorney: Dean E. Nicholson, 3 Washington Square, Haverhill, Mass. Authority sought to operate as a *contract carrier*, by motor vehicle, over ir-

regular routes, transporting: *Textile products between Lawrence and Haverhill, Mass., on the one hand, and, on the other, Providence and Pawtucket, R.I.*

HEARING: July 12, 1962, at the New Post Office and Court House Building, Boston, Mass., before Joint Board No. 190.

No. MC 124296, filed March 23, 1962. Applicant: GEORGE L. BIGELOW, Wright Street, Delavan, Wis. Applicant's attorney: William C. Dineen, 746 Empire Building, 710 North Plankinton Avenue, Milwaukee 3, Wis. Authority sought to operate as a *contract carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Fertilizer*, (1) from Madison, Wis. (under a continuing contract with Roysters Guano Co., of Madison, Wis.), and from Whitewater, Wis. (under a continuing contract with Federal Chemical Co., of Whitewater, Wis.), to points in Illinois on and north of U.S. Highway 6, and (2) from Streator, Ill. (under a continuing contract with Smith Douglas Fertilizer Co., Streator, Ill.), and from Union and Chicago Heights, Ill. (under a continuing contract with International Fertilizer Co. of Union and Chicago Heights, Ill.), from Dubuque, Iowa (under a continuing contract with V C Fertilizer Co., Dubuque, Iowa), and from Danville, Ill. (under a continuing contract with Federal Chemical Company, of Whitewater, Wis.), to points in Wisconsin on and south of U.S. Highway 10.

HEARING: July 24, 1962, at the Wisconsin Public Service Commission, Madison, Wis., before Joint Board 111.

No. MC 124301, filed March 26, 1962. Applicant: JOHN PERRY, 14 Brewster Street, South Dartmouth, Mass. Authority sought to operate as a *contract carrier*, by motor vehicle, over a regular route, transporting: *Liquid petroleum products*, in bulk, in tank vehicles, between New Bedford, Mass., and East Providence, R.I., from New Bedford over U.S. Highway 6 to the Seekonk, Mass.-East Providence, R.I., city line, thence over city streets to the site of the Mobil Oil Co. plant in East Providence, and return over the same route, serving no intermediate points.

HEARING: July 10, 1962, at the Federal Building, Providence, R.I., before Joint Board No. 18.

No. MC 124326, filed April 5, 1962. Applicant: TAVENS TRANSPORTATION CORP., 2806 East 51st Street, Cleveland, Ohio. Applicant's attorney: Edwin C. Reminger, 905 The Leader Building, Cleveland 14, Ohio. Authority sought to operate as a *contract carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: (1) *Paper, paper articles, packaging materials, and machinery, equipment, materials and supplies used or useful in the manufacture of paper, paper articles, and packaging materials*, and (2) *waste materials, for conversion or reclamation, and machinery, equipment, materials and supplies used or useful in the conversion or reclamation of waste materials*, between points in Ohio, on the one hand, and, on the other, points in Connecticut, Delaware, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Maryland, Massachusetts,

New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Vermont, West Virginia, and the District of Columbia.

NOTE: Applicant states the proposed operation will be conducted under a continuing contract with Tavens Container Corp., Cleveland, Ohio, and Acme Waste Products, Inc., Cleveland, Ohio.

HEARING: July 13, 1962, at the Old Post Office Building, Public Square and Superior Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio, before Examiner James Anton.

No. MC 124340 (Sub-No. 1) (AMENDMENT), filed April 9, 1962, published FEDERAL REGISTER issue of May 9, 1962, amended May 25, 1962, and republished, as amended, this issue. Applicant: A-P-A TRANSPORT CORP., 2110 85th Street, North Bergen, N.J. Applicant's attorney: Herbert Burstein, 160 Broadway, New York 38, N.Y. Authority sought to operate as a *contract carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: (1) *Corrugated boxes and corrugated paper products, fiberboard boxes and fiberboard paper products, pulp board boxes and pulp board paper products, and store display racks* of the above-specified commodities, from points in Pennsauken Township, N.J., to points in Delaware, points in Maryland (except points in Garrett and Allegany Counties), points in Pennsylvania on and east of the western boundary of Tioga, Lycoming, Union, Mifflin, Juniata, and Franklin Counties, and the District of Columbia, and (2) *rejected, damaged, and returned shipments* of the commodities specified in (1) above, from the above-specified areas to points in Pennsauken Township, N.J.

NOTE: Applicant states it proposes to provide the proposed service under continuing contracts with the Weyerhaeuser Company. The purpose of this republication is to broaden the scope of the authority sought.

HEARING: Remains as assigned June 27, 1962, at 346 Broadway, New York, N.Y., before Examiner Garland E. Taylor.

No. MC 124354, filed May 2, 1962. Applicant: PARENTE TRUCKING SERVICE, INC., 80-18 31st Avenue, Jackson Heights, Queens, N.Y. Applicant's attorney: Morris Honig, 150 Broadway, New York 38, N.Y. Authority sought to operate as a *contract carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: (1) *Carbonated beverages*, in bottles, in cases, and cartons, from Newark, N.J., to Yonkers, N.Y.; (2) *carbonated beverages*, in cans, and in cartons, from New York, N.Y., to Asbury Park, Newark, North Brunswick and Paterson, N.J., and (3) *empty containers or other such incidental facilities* (not specified), used in transporting the above-specified commodities, in connection with (1) and (2) above, on return.

HEARING: July 13, 1962, at 346 Broadway, New York, N.Y., before Examiner W. Elliott Nefflen.

No. MC 124356 (Sub-No. 1), filed April 16, 1962. Applicant: JULIUS E. BLAESS, AND WILLIAM K. BLAESS, a copartnership, doing business as BLAESS ELEVATOR COMPANY, 11800 Dexter Chelsea Road, Chelsea, Mich.

Applicant's attorney: Wilhelmina Boersma, 2850 Penobscot Building, Detroit 26, Mich. Authority sought to operate as a *contract carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: (1) *Animal and poultry feed*, from the site of Blaess Elevator Company located approximately three (3) miles east of Chelsea, Mich., to points in Ohio and Indiana, and (2) *ingredients used or useful in the manufacture of animal and poultry feed*, from points in Ohio and Indiana to the site of Blaess Elevator Company approximately three (3) miles east of Chelsea, Mich.

NOTE: Applicant states the proposed transportation is to be performed under a continuing contract with Larowe Feed Co.

HEARING: July 13, 1962, at the Federal Building, Lansing, Mich., before Joint Board 9.

No. MC 124363 (Sub-No. 1), filed April 16, 1962. Applicant: GEORGE R. EDDLEMAN, CLARENCE J. EDDLEMAN, CHARLIE R. EDDLEMAN AND JOE W. EDDLEMAN, a partnership, doing business as EDDLEMAN BROTHERS, 6051 Ivanhoe Street, Denver 16, Colo. Applicant's attorney: Herbert M. Boyle, 738 Majestic Building, Denver 2, Colo. Authority sought to operate as a *contract carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Meat, meat products, meat byproducts, articles distributed by meat packinghouses*, as defined by the Commission, and frozen foods, between points in Denver, Adams, Jefferson, Arapahoe, and Weld Counties, Colo., and points in Texas, Arizona, California, Oregon, Washington, and Utah.

NOTE: Applicant states it also proposes to transport exempt agricultural commodities.

HEARING: July 17, 1962, at the New Customs House, Denver, Colo., before Examiner Henry A. Cockrum.

No. MC 124375, filed April 16, 1962. Applicant: UTILITY TRANSPORTATION CORPORATION, 24-14 Steinway Street, Astoria 3, N.Y. Authority sought to operate as a *contract carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Cameras, and cinema and photographic materials*, between New York, N.Y., and Teterboro and South Hackensack, N.J.

HEARING: July 10, 1962, at 346 Broadway, New York, N.Y., before Examiner W. Elliott Nefflen.

No. MC 124377, filed April 18, 1962. Applicant: REFRIGERATED FOODS, INC., 3200 Blake Street, Denver 5, Colo. Applicant's attorney: John R. Barry, 738 Majestic Building, Denver 2, Colo. Authority sought to operate as a *contract carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Meat, meat products, fresh, smoked, cured, or cooked, frozen or canned meat byproducts, and articles distributed by meat packinghouses* as defined by the Commission, from points in York County, Nebr., and Denver County, Colo., to points in El Paso County, Tex., and points in Wyoming, Montana, Colorado, Arizona, New Mexico, Utah, Idaho, Washington, Oregon, Nevada, and California; and exempt commodities (fish and horticultural commodities) on return trips.

HEARING: July 19, 1962, at the New Customs House, Denver, Colo., before Examiner Henry A. Cockrum.

No. MC 124382, filed April 19, 1962. Applicant: RUSSELL HOLMES, R.R. No. 1, Cardinal, Ontario, Canada. Authority sought to operate as a *contract carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Bagged and bulk gluten meal and feed* from ports of entry on the international boundary line between United States and Canada, to points in New York.

NOTE: Applicant indicates that the proposed operations will be under contract with Canada Starch Co., Ltd., Cardinal, Ontario, Canada.

HEARING: July 16, 1962, at the Federal Building, Syracuse, N.Y., before Examiner Lyle C. Farmer.

No. MC 124387, filed April 16, 1962. Applicant: JAMES A. NICHOLS, EDWARD H. HILDEBRAND AND ROBERT C. HILDEBRAND, doing business as NICHOLS & HILDEBRAND, INC., 5301 East 61st Way, Denver 16, Colo. Applicant's attorney: Herbert M. Boyle, 738 Majestic Building, Denver 2, Colo. Authority sought to operate as a *contract carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Meat, meat products, meat byproducts, and articles distributed by meat packinghouses*, as defined by the Commission, between points in Denver, Arapahoe, Jefferson, Adams, Weld, and Pueblo Counties, Colo., Cheyenne, Dawson, York, Lancaster, Otero, and Douglas Counties, Nebr., Pottawattamie County, Iowa, Sedgwick, Wyandotte, and Shawnee Counties, Kans., Yellowstone County, Mont., Goshen County, Wyo., and Canyon County, Idaho, on the one hand, and, on the other, points in Los Angeles, San Diego, Kern, and San Francisco Counties, Calif.; and *exempt commodities* on return trips.

HEARING: July 18, 1962, at the New Customs House, Denver, Colo., before Examiner Henry A. Cockrum.

No. MC 124392, filed April 20, 1962. Applicant: VICTOR McCOLLUM, doing business as H. C. BYROL TRUCKING COMPANY, 920 Bellefonte Avenue, Lock Haven, Pa. Applicant's attorney: Edward L. Willard, 201 East Beaver Avenue, State College, Pa. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Crated, uncrated and partially crated airplanes and airplane parts*, from Lock Haven, Pa., to Teterboro Airport, Bergen County, N.J., Newark Airport, Newark, N.J., Idlewild Airport in the Borough of Queens, County of Queens, and State of New York, and La Guardia Airport in the Borough of Queens, and State of New York, Zone 1, Borough of Manhattan, 145th Street and south thereof; Borough of Bronx, The Borough of Bronx on the south of the following described line: 149th Street from Harlem River to the east side of Park Avenue; east side of Park Avenue to 152d Street; 152d Street to Prospect Avenue; Prospect Avenue to Southern Boulevard and 149th Street; 149th Street to the East River; Borough of Brooklyn, The Borough of Brooklyn west of and including points from the East

River at and including Newton Creek to Metropolitan Avenue to Liberty Avenue; thence Liberty Avenue to East New York Avenue; East New York Avenue to Utica Avenue to Linden Boulevard; Linden Boulevard to Redford Avenue; Redford Avenue to Church Avenue; Church Avenue to Ocean Parkway; Ocean Parkway to Cortelyou Road; Cortelyou Road to 16th Avenue; 16th Avenue to 65th Street; thence Westerly on 65th Street to Fourth Avenue; then along Fourth Avenue to Bay Ridge Avenue; thence Westerly on Bay Ridge Avenue to Staten Island Ferry Slip and New York Bay; Borough of Queens, The Borough of Queens within the following limits: The East River and Flushing Bay; Grand Central Parkway Extension from Flushing Bay to Interborough Parkway; Interborough Parkway to the Brooklyn Borough Line and the Brooklyn Borough line to the East River. Zone 2, Borough of Manhattan, remainder of Borough not included in Zone 1, Borough of Bronx, remainder of Borough not included in Zone 1, Borough of Brooklyn, remainder of Borough not included in Zone 1, Borough of Queens, East of Zone 1 to and including the following line: Bell Boulevard from Little Bay to Northern Boulevard; Northern Boulevard to 156th Street; 156th Street and Oak Avenue to Kissena Boulevard; Kissena Boulevard to 73d Avenue; 73d Avenue to Parsons Boulevard; Parsons Boulevard to Hillside Avenue; Hillside Avenue to 190th Street; 190th Street to Farmers Boulevard; Farmers Boulevard to Rockaway Boulevard; Rockaway Boulevard to the eastern boundary of Idlewild Airport; thence along the eastern boundary of Idlewild Airport to Jamaica Bay thence along the North Shore of Jamaica Bay to the Queens-Kings County Line; Borough of Richmond, Staten Island in its entirety, and points in Essex, Union, Bergen, Middlesex, and Hudson Counties, N.J., and *empty containers or other such incidental facilities* (not specified) used in transporting the above-specified commodities, on return.

HEARING: July 11, 1962, at the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission, Harrisburg, Pa., before Examiner Joseph A. Reilly.

No. MC 124394, filed April 23, 1962. Applicant: NELSON TRUCKING, INC., 620 Industrial Avenue, Mount Pleasant, Mich. Authority sought to operate as a *contract carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Oil and gas well equipment, machinery, supplies and materials*, between points in Michigan, on the one hand, and, on the other, points in Michigan, Indiana, and Ohio.

HEARING: July 12, 1962, at the Federal Building, Lansing, Mich., before Joint Board 9.

No. MC 124395, filed April 20, 1962. Applicant: GUSTAVE CLAVEAU AND RAYMOND J. CLAVEAU, a partnership, doing business as CLAVEAU TRANSPORTATION, Mill Street, Ashland, N.H. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: (1) *Liquefied petroleum gas*, in cylinders, and bulk, and (2) *related accessories, such as hoods, regulators, pigtails, and stands*,

from Fairlee, Vt., to points in New Hampshire.

HEARING: July 27, 1962, at the New Hampshire Public Service Commission, Concord, N.H., before Joint Board No. 132.

No. MC 124398, filed April 23, 1962. Applicant: ALBEE TRUCKING COMPANY, INC., 1820 Center Street, Wolfboro, N.H. Applicant's attorney: George W. Walker, Rochester Realty Building, Rochester, N.H. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Household goods*, loose and containerized, between points in New Hampshire.

HEARING: July 26, 1962, at the New Hampshire Public Service Commission, Concord, N.H., before Joint Board No. 186.

No. MC 124400 (Sub-No. 1), filed April 26, 1962. Applicant: TELISCHAK TRUCKING, INC., 12300 Farmington Road, Livonia, Mich. Applicant's attorney: Robert A. Sullivan, 1800 Buhl Building, Detroit 26, Mich. Authority sought to operate as a *contract carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Precast concrete slabs and beams of such size and weight as to require special equipment, and accessories and materials incidental to the installation thereof*, (1) from the plant site of Price Brothers located at Livonia, Mich., to points in Ohio, Indiana, Pennsylvania, and Kentucky, (2) from the plant site of Lake Erie Flexicore Co., Inc., wholly owned subsidiary of Price Brothers, located at Kent, Ohio, to points in Michigan, Indiana, Pennsylvania, and Kentucky, and (3) from the plant site of Price Brothers located at Dayton, Ohio to points in Michigan, Indiana, Pennsylvania, and Kentucky; and *returned and rejected shipments, supplies and materials, incidental to the manufacture of prestressed and reinforced concrete beams and slabs*, on return.

NOTE: Applicant states the proposed service will be performed under a continuing contract, or contracts, with Price Brothers Company. Applicant further states, "In the event the instant contract carrier authority is granted, covering the entire State of Ohio, it is agreeable to the cancellation of authority granted in the Sub 9 proceeding." Applicant has common carrier authority in MC 107376 and Sub-No. 6 thereunder; therefore, dual operations may be involved.

HEARING: July 16, 1962, at the Detroit-Leland Hotel, Detroit, Mich., before Examiner James Anton.

No. MC 124404, filed April 25, 1962. Applicant: MILTON H. LORD, R.F.D. No. 1, Warwick, N.Y. Applicant's representative: Charles H. Trayford, 220 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y. Authority sought to operate as a *contract carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: (1) *Dry fertilizer*, from South Kearny, Englishtown, and Yardville, N.J., to points in Orange County, N.Y., and (2) *limestone*, in bags, from Limecrest, and Franklin, N.J., to points in Orange County, N.Y.

HEARING: July 12, 1962, at 346 Broadway, New York, N.Y., before Examiner W. Elliott Nefflen.

No. MC 124406 (Sub-No. 1), filed April 27, 1962. Applicant: CARL W.

ARNOLD, doing business as CARL'S TRUCKING, P.O. Box 754, Lander, Wyo. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Lumber, wood products and forest products* from mill sites in Fremont County, Wyo., to Riverton, Wyo., for subsequent movement to points outside Wyoming by other authorized carriers.

HEARING: July 27, 1962, at the Wyoming Public Service Commission, Cheyenne, Wyo., before Joint Board No. 197, or, if the Joint Board waives its right to participate, before Examiner Henry A. Cockrum.

No. MC 124422, filed April 30, 1962. Applicant: T. & F. QUINN TRUCKING CO., INC., 532 West 46th Street, New York 19, N.Y. Applicant's attorney: Edward M. Alfano, 2 West 45th Street, New York 36, N.Y. Authority sought to operate as a *contract carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Commodities such as are dealt in by an importer of photographic paper, film and related materials and supplies*, from the site of the warehouse of The Gevaert Co. of America, Inc., Teterboro, N.J., to New York, N.Y., and points in Nassau County, N.Y., and *returned and damaged shipments of the same commodities* on return.

NOTE: Applicant states that the operations will be under a continuing contract with The Gevaert Company, whom it has been serving within New York, N.Y., for 35 years.

HEARING: July 13, 1962, at 346 Broadway, New York, N.Y., before Examiner W. Elliott Nefflen.

No. MC 124423, filed May 2, 1962. Applicant: JET MESSENGER SERVICE, INC., Hillsdale Road, Oak Tree, N.J. Applicant's attorney: Leroy Danziger, 334 King Road, North Brunswick, N.J. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *General commodities* (except Classes A and B explosives, household goods as defined by the Commission, commodities in bulk and commodities requiring special equipment), moving in express service in station wagons and panel trucks, between points in Bergen, Essex, Hudson, Middlesex, Morris, Monmouth, Passaic, Somerset, Sussex, and Union Counties, N.J., on the one hand, and, on the other, New York, N.Y., points in Nassau, Suffolk, Westchester, and Rockland Counties, N.Y., points in Connecticut, Boston, Mass., and points in Massachusetts within 25 miles of Boston, points in Philadelphia, Delaware, Lehigh and Northampton Counties, Pa., Wilmington, Del., and points in Bergen, Essex, Hudson, Middlesex, Passaic, Somerset, and Union Counties, N.J.

HEARING: July 9, 1962, at the Offices of the Interstate Commerce Commission, Washington, D.C., before Examiner John L. York.

No. MC 124428 (Sub-No. 1), filed May 8, 1962. Applicant: EDWARD C. KEEFE, doing business as KEEFE'S EXPRESS, Newington Road, Portsmouth, N.H. Applicant's attorney: Francis E. Barrett, Jr., 25 Bryant Avenue, East Milton 86 (Boston), Mass.

Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *General commodities* (except explosives), in packages, or parcels not exceeding 75 pounds each, in retail delivery service, from Portsmouth, N.H., to points in Rockingham and Strafford Counties, N.H., and Kittery, Maine; and *returned and damaged shipments of the above commodities* from above destination points to Portsmouth, N.H.

NOTE: Applicant states that the operations will be restricted to traffic having a prior or subsequent movement by freight forwarder. Applicant further states that it owns shares in Associated Deliveries, Inc., a freight forwarder operating under authority of this Commission.

HEARING: July 25, 1962, at the New Hampshire Public Service Commission, Concord, N.H., before Joint Board No. 114.

No. MC 124430, filed May 4, 1962. Applicant: BLAIR T. CLAYPOOLE AND RODERICK C. CLAYPOOLE, doing business as CLAYPOOLE TRUCKING, R.D. No. 1, Worthington, Pa. Applicant's attorney: H. Ray Pope, Jr., Clarion, Pa. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: (1) *Clay products* from St. Marys, Pa., to points in New York, Maine, New Jersey, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, Rhode Island, Delaware, New Hampshire, Vermont, and the District of Columbia; and (2) *empty containers or other such incidental facilities* (not specified) used in transporting the commodities above, and *commodities used or useful in the manufacture of clay products*, in return movements.

NOTE: Applicants state that Blair T. Claypoole presently holds contract authority under MC-115411; that application to change that authority to common carrier authority is in process; and that after such change is made, transfer of said authority to applicants will be requested.

HEARING: July 9, 1962, at the Offices of the Interstate Commerce Commission, Washington, D.C., before Examiner Francis A. Welch.

No. MC 124431, filed May 3, 1962. Applicant: RICHARD G. LAWS, doing business as D. & S. LEASING SERVICE, Wetzell Road, Liverpool, N.Y. Applicant's attorney: Francis E. Barrett, Jr., Professional Building, 25 Bryant Avenue, East Milton 86, Boston, Mass. Authority sought to operate as a *contract carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Sheet steel cans*, from Boston, Mass., to points in New York on and north of U.S. Highway 6.

NOTE: Applicant states that the proposed operation is under a continuing contract with Stern Can Co., Inc.

HEARING: July 11, 1962, at the New Post Office and Court House Building, Boston, Mass., before Joint Board No. 191.

MOTOR CARRIERS OF PASSENGERS

No. MC 172 (Sub-No. 2), filed April 19, 1962. Applicant: ARNOLD E. WADE, 1312 Helderberg Avenue, Schenectady 6, N.Y. Applicant's attorney:

Edward L. Merrigan, 425 13th Street NW., Washington 4, D.C. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Passengers and their baggage*, in the same vehicle with passengers, (1) in one-way and round-trip charter operations from points in that part of New York bounded by a line beginning at Windham, N.Y., and extending through Gilboa to Cooperstown, thence through Sharon Springs to Amsterdam, thence through Hoffmans to Schenectady and thence through South Berne to point of beginning to points in the United States, including Alaska and including Ports of Entry on the International Boundary line between the United States and Canada and (2) in round-trip, special operations beginning and ending at points in that part of New York bounded by a line beginning at Windham, N.Y., and extending through Gilboa to Cooperstown, thence through Sharon Springs to Amsterdam, thence through Hoffmans to Schenectady and thence through South Berne to point of beginning to points in the United States, including Alaska and including Ports of Entry on the International Boundary line between the United States and Canada.

HEARING: July 10, 1962, at the Federal Building, Albany, N.Y., before Examiner Lyle C. Farmer.

No. MC 668 (Sub-No. 80), filed April 16, 1962. Applicant: INTER-CITY TRANSPORTATION CO., INC., 730 Madison Avenue, Paterson, N.J. Applicant's attorney: Edward F. Bowes, 1060 Broad Street, Newark 2, N.J. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over regular routes, transporting: *Passengers and their baggage, express and newspapers*, in the same vehicle with passengers, between New York City, N.Y., and Babylon, N.Y., from New York City, over New York Highway 24 (also known as Long Island Expressway) to junction New York Highway 24 and access roads leading to Guinea Woods Road (also known as Glen Cove Road) near East Hills, N.Y., thence over such access roads to Guinea Woods Road, thence over Guinea Woods Road to junction Jericho Turnpike in North Hempstead, near Carle Place, thence over Jericho Turnpike to junction Mineola Boulevard, in Mineola, thence over Mineola Boulevard until it becomes Franklin Avenue at the Mineola-Garden City municipal line, thence over Franklin Avenue until it becomes North Franklin Street at the Hempstead-Garden City municipal line, thence over North Franklin Street to junction New York Highway 24A in Hempstead, thence over New York Highway 24A through Hempstead, Uniondale, East Meadow, Levittown, Plainedge, and Farmingdale, N.Y., to junction New York Highway 110 near East Farmingdale in Suffolk County, N.Y., thence over New York Highway 110 to junction New York Highway 27A in Amityville, N.Y., thence over New York Highway 27A to Babylon, and return over the same route (except that on such return westbound access roads from Guinea Woods Road to New York Highway 24 must be used) serving all intermediate points.

NOTE: Applicant proposes to segment the proposed route to its existing authority in MC 668 whereby it provides regular route service in the states of New Jersey and New York as set forth therein.

NOTE: Common control may be involved.

HEARING: July 25, 1962, at 346 Broadway, New York, N.Y., before Examiner Joseph A. Reilly.

No. MC 1501 (Sub-No. 256) (AMENDMENT), filed December 18, 1961, published FEDERAL REGISTER issue of March 7, 1962, amended April 30, 1962, and republished, as amended, this issue. Applicant: THE GREYHOUND CORPORATION, 140 South Dearborn Street, Chicago 3, Ill. Applicant's attorney: Thomas F. Kilroy, Suite 912 Federal Bar Building, 1815 H Street N.W., Washington 6, D.C. Authority sought to operate as a common carrier, by motor vehicle, over regular routes, transporting: *Passengers and their baggage*, and *express, newspapers and mail*, in the same vehicle with passengers, between the junction of U.S. Highways 25 and 176 south of Hendersonville, N.C., and Spartanburg, S.C., over U.S. Highway 176 and return over the same route, serving no intermediate points.

NOTE: The purpose of this republication is to change the route description.

HEARING: July 9, 1962, at the U.S. Court Rooms, Uptown Post Office Building, Raleigh, N.C., before Joint Board No. 2, or, if the Joint Board waives its right to participate before Examiner Laurence E. Masoner.

No. MC 1934 (Sub-No. 7), filed April 20, 1962. Applicant: THE ARROW LINE, INC., 70 Florence Street, Hartford, Conn. Applicant's attorney: Thomas W. Murrett, 410 Asylum Street, Hartford, Conn. Authority sought to operate as a common carrier, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Passengers and their baggage*, in the same vehicle with passengers, in special round-trip operations, beginning and ending at Hartford, Meriden, Wallingford, New Haven, and Bridgeport, Conn., and extending to the sites of Yankee Stadium and the New York Polo Grounds, New York, N.Y.

HEARING: July 18, 1962, at the Hartford Statler Hilton, Hartford, Conn., before Examiner W. Elliott Neffien.

No. MC 85028 (Sub-No. 10), filed March 2, 1962. Applicant: BERKSHIRE STREET RAILWAY COMPANY, a corporation, 1277 East Street, Pittsfield, Mass. Applicant's attorney: Edward N. Gadsby, 200 Maryland Avenue N.E., Washington 2, D.C. Authority sought to operate as a common carrier, by motor vehicle, over regular routes, transporting: *Passengers and their baggage, express, mail, and newspapers*, in the same vehicle with passengers, between Pittsfield, Mass., and Albany, N.Y.; from Pittsfield at Park Square over U.S. Highway 20 to the intersection of Massachusetts Highway 41, thence over Massachusetts Highway 41 to the intersection of Massachusetts Highway 295, thence over Massachusetts Highway 295 to the Massachusetts-New York State line, continuing on New York Highway 295 to Chatham, N.Y., thence over New York Highway 203 to the Vala-

tile, N.Y., thence over New York Columbia County Road 28 through Niverville, N.Y., to its intersection with U.S. Highway 9, thence over U.S. Highway 9 to its intersection with U.S. Highway 20 at East Greenbush, N.Y., thence over U.S. Highway 20 to Albany, and return over the same route, serving Canaan, East Chatham, Chatham, Valatie, and Niverville, N.Y., as intermediate points.

HEARING: July 12, 1962, at the Federal Building, Albany, N.Y., before Examiner Lyle C. Farmer.

No. MC 93443 (Sub-No. 4), filed May 17, 1962. Applicant: SCHENECTADY TRANSPORTATION CORPORATION, 1344 Albany Street, Schenectady 4, N.Y. Applicant's attorney: Harry Shereff, 292 Madison Avenue, New York 17, N.Y. Authority sought to operate as a common carrier, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Passengers and their baggage*, in the same vehicle, in special operations, from Schenectady, N.Y., and points within 35 miles of Schenectady, to points in Connecticut, Delaware, Illinois, Indiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, New Hampshire, New Jersey, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Virginia, Vermont, West Virginia, the District of Columbia, and New York, and return.

HEARING: July 13, 1962, at the Federal Building, Albany, N.Y., before Examiner Lyle C. Farmer.

No. MC 109665 (Sub-No. 6), filed April 18, 1962. Applicant: ARGENTINE TRANSIT LINES, INC., 1707 WEST 39th Avenue, Kansas City, Kans. Authority sought to operate as a common carrier, by motor vehicle, over regular routes, transporting: *Passengers and their baggage*, in the same vehicles with passengers, (1) between 58th and Lamar Streets, and Southwest Boulevard, Kansas City, Kans., as an extension of applicant's authorized regular route (Shawnee), as follows: From 58th and Lamar Streets, north on Lamar to 53d Street, thence east on 53d to Outlook Street, thence south on Outlook to 55th Street, thence east on 55th to Nall Street, thence east on Nall to Sycamore Street, thence northeast on Sycamore to Linden Street, thence north on Linden to 51st Street, thence east on 51st to Santa Fe Drive, thence east on Santa Fe to Buena Vista Drive, thence east on Buena Vista to 52d Street, thence northeast on 52d to Clark Drive, thence south on Clark to Neosho Street, thence north on Neosho to 50th Street, thence east on 50th to Mission Road, thence north on Mission to 47th Street, thence east on 47th to Rainbow Street, thence north on Rainbow to Southwest Boulevard, and return over the same route, serving all intermediate points; and (2) between 48th and Melody and 34th and Steele Road, in Kansas City, Kans., as an extension of applicant's present Quivira Line, between Kansas City, Kans. and Kansas City, Mo., as follows: From 34th Street and Steele Road, thence south on 34th to Shawnee Drive, thence east on Shawnee Drive to 28th Street, thence south on 28th to Hageman Street, thence west on Hageman to 34th, thence south on 34th to Woodend Street, thence west on Woodend to 37th Street, thence north

on 37th to Shawnee Drive, thence west on Shawnee Drive to 42d Street, thence north on 42d to Gibbs Road, thence west on Gibbs to 51st Street, thence south on 51st Street through Highland Crest Addition to Crest Drive, thence west on Crest to 51st Terrace, thence north on 51st Terrace to Alma, thence west on Alma to 53d Street, thence south on 53d to Locust, thence east on Locust to Shawnee Drive, thence northeast on Shawnee to 48th Street, thence north on 48th to Woodend Road, thence east on Woodend to 47th Street, thence north on 47th to Crest Drive, thence west on Crest Drive to 48th Street, thence north on 48th to Melody, and return over the same route, serving all intermediate points.

HEARING: July 25, 1962, at Park East Hotel, Kansas City, Mo., before Joint Board No. 36, or, if the Joint Board waives its right to participate, before Examiner Samuel C. Shoup.

No. MC 110373 (Sub-No. 6), filed April 30, 1962. Applicant: NORTHEAST COACH LINES, 730 Madison Avenue, Paterson, N.J. Applicant's attorney: Edward F. Bowes, 1060 Broad Street, Newark 2, N.J. Authority sought to operate as a common carrier, by motor vehicle, over regular routes, transporting: *Passengers and their baggage and express and newspapers*, in the same vehicle with passengers, between Pequannock Township and Wayne Township, N.J.; from junction Jackson Avenue (also known as Pompton Plains Crossroad) and Newark and Pompton Turnpike in Pequannock Township, over Jackson Avenue to junction Black Oak Ridge Road (also known as U.S. Highway 202), thence over U.S. Highway 202 to junction Ratzer Road and New Jersey Highway 23 in Wayne Township, and return over the same route, serving all intermediate points.

NOTE: Applicant states "the President of the applicant herein owns and controls Inter-City Transportation Co., Inc., a corporation authorized in Docket MC 668 to transport passengers and their baggage via regular routes between New York and Hokokus, Ridgewood, Midland Park, and Paterson, serving all intermediate points on specified routes. Regular route service is also provided between New York, N.Y., and points in Sullivan and Ulster Counties, N.Y., via New Jersey. His acquisition of control of the applicant was authorized in Docket MC-F-4231. Applicant's President also controls Warwick-Greenwood Lake and New York Transit, Inc., Docket MC 123577 and sub numbers thereunder, which operates between New York, N.Y., and Warwick, N.Y., via New Jersey, such control being acquired in Docket MC-F-7645."

HEARING: July 9, 1962, in Room 212, State Office Building, 1100 Raymond Boulevard, Newark, N.J., before Joint Board No. 119.

No. MC 115891 (Sub-No. 2), filed May 1, 1962. Applicant: INTER-COUNTY MOTOR COACH, INC., 243 Deer Park Avenue, Babylon, N.Y. Applicant's representative: William D. Traub, 10 East 40th Street, New York 16, N.Y. Authority sought to operate as a common carrier, by motor vehicle, over a regular route, transporting: *Passengers and their baggage, and express and newspapers*, in the same vehicle with passengers, be-

tween New York, N.Y., and Babylon, N.Y., from New York over New York Highway 24 (Long Island Expressway) in Nassau County, N.Y., to junction with access roads leading to Guinea Woods Road, thence over access roads to Guinea Woods Road, thence over Guinea Woods Road to its junction with Jericho Turnpike, thence over Jericho Turnpike to its junction with Mineola Boulevard, in Mineola, N.Y., thence over Mineola Boulevard to its junction with Franklin Avenue, thence over Franklin Avenue through Garden City, N.Y., to its junction with North Franklin Street, thence over North Franklin Street to its junction with New York Highway 24A in Hempstead, N.Y., thence over New York Highway 24A through East Meadow, Levittown, Plainedge, and Farmingdale to its junction with New York Highway 110 in Suffolk County, N.Y., thence over New York Highway 110 to its junction with New York Highway 27A in Amityville, N.Y., thence over New York Highway 27A to Babylon, and return over the same route (except from Guinea Woods Road to New York Highway 24 using access roads provided for use in such reverse direction), serving all intermediate points.

HEARING: July 25, 1962, at 346 Broadway, New York, N.Y., before Examiner Joseph A. Reilly.

No. MC 123748 (Sub-No. 4), filed May 14, 1962. Applicant: CONNECTICUT LIMOUSINE SERVICE, INC., 156 Humphrey Street, New Haven, Conn. Applicant's attorney: Palmer S. McGee, Jr., 750 Main Street, Hartford 3, Conn. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over regular routes, transporting: *Passengers and their baggage*, in the same vehicle with passengers, between New Haven and Waterbury, Conn. on the one hand, and on the other, the site of the World's Fair at Flushing Meadows Park, New York, N.Y., over the following routes and serving the stated intermediate points: (1) Originating at New Haven, proceeding over New Haven city streets to U.S. Interstate Highway 95 (also called the Connecticut Turnpike); thence over U.S. Interstate Highway 95 to the Connecticut-New York state line; thence over U.S. Interstate Highway 95 (also called the New England Thruway) to the New York City line; thence over New York City streets, boulevards, expressways and avenues, and Whitestone Bridge or Throggs Neck Bridge to the World's Fair site at Flushing Meadows Park, New York City, and return along a reverse of the foregoing routes, serving the intermediate points of Bridgeport, Fairfield, Westport, Norwalk, Darien, Stamford, Greenwich, and Stratford, Conn.; and (2) originating at Waterbury, proceeding over Waterbury city streets to Connecticut Highway 8; thence over Connecticut Highway 8 to Bridgeport; thence over Bridgeport city streets to Stratford; thence over Stratford city streets to U.S. Interstate Highway 95 (also called the Connecticut Turnpike); thence over U.S. Interstate Highway 95 to Fairfield; thence over the route described in (1) above to the World's Fair site at Flushing Meadows Park, New York City, and re-

turn over the same route, serving the intermediate points of Naugatuck, Seymour, Derby, Stratford, and Bridgeport, Conn.

NOTE: Applicant states that the proposed operation will be seasonal between the opening and closing dates of the World's Fair. Applicant further states that it proposes to coordinate and join the service here proposed with operations conducted by it between New Haven and Waterbury, Conn. (and various intermediate points) and New York International Airport (Idlewild), N.Y., and La Guardia Airport, N.Y., and to transfer passengers to and from the two New York airports.

HEARING: July 19, 1962, at the Hartford Statler Hilton, Hartford, Conn., before Examiner W. Elliott Nefflen.

No. MC 124433, filed May 7, 1962. Applicant: C. H. NORTON, R.R. No. 1, Burlington, Ontario, Canada. Applicant's attorney: Walter N. Bieneman, Guardian Building, Detroit 26, Mich. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Passengers and their baggage*, in special and charter operations, from Ports of Entry on the International Boundary line between the United States and Canada at the St. Lawrence, Niagara, Detroit, St. Clair, St. Mary, Pigeon, and Rainy Rivers, to points in the United States (except Alaska and Hawaii), and return.

NOTE: Applicant states all special or chartered trips shall originate and terminate in the Province of Ontario, Canada.

HEARING: July 23, 1962, at the Hotel Buffalo, Washington and Swan Streets, Buffalo, N.Y., before Examiner Lyle C. Farmer.

APPLICATION FOR BROKERAGE LICENSE

No. MC 12697 (Sub-No. 1), filed May 3, 1962. Applicant: ESTHER BRIGGS DEA JAMES, 460 Seventh Avenue, Salt Lake City, Utah. Applicant's attorney: Irene Warr, 419—Judge Building, Salt Lake City, Utah. For a license (BMC 5) to engage in operations as a *broker* at Salt Lake City, Utah, in arranging for transportation in interstate or foreign commerce of *passengers and their baggage*, in special and charter operations, beginning and ending at points in Utah, Idaho, Arizona, Nevada, and California, and extending to points in the United States.

HEARING: July 26, 1962, at the Utah Public Service Commission, Salt Lake City, Utah, before Joint Board No. 207, or, if the Joint Board waives its right to participate, before Examiner Henry A. Cockrum.

No. MC 12798 (CLARIFICATION), filed March 19, 1962, published FEDERAL REGISTER issue April 25, 1962, and republished as clarified this issue. Applicant: DENVER-BOULDER BUS COMPANY, a corporation, doing business as DENVER TRAVEL AGENCY, 1805 Broadway, Denver 2, Colo. Applicant's attorney: David Butler, 500 Equitable Building, Denver 2, Colo. For a license (BMC 5) to engage in operations as a *broker* at Denver, Colo., in arranging for transportation by motor vehicle in interstate or foreign commerce of *passengers and their baggage*, in the same vehicle, both as individuals and in groups, in

round trip all-expense tours, between points in the United States.

NOTE: The purpose of this republication is to broaden the scope of the authority sought.

HEARING: Remains as assigned June 25, 1962, at the Albany Hotel, Denver, Colo., before Joint Board No. 126, or, if the Joint Board waives its right to participate, before Examiner Donald R. Sutherland.

No. MC 12803, filed April 12, 1962. Applicant: WHALE TOURS COMPANY, 18 North Main Street, Fall River, Mass. For a license (BMC 5) to engage in operations as a *broker* at Fall River, Mass., in arranging for transportation in interstate or foreign commerce by motor vehicle, of *passengers and their baggage*, in the same vehicle with passengers, both as individuals and groups (including civic, religious, fraternal and industrial), in round trip, special, conducted, and charter operations consisting of educational, historical and sightseeing tours, beginning and ending at Fall River, Mass., and extending to points in the United States.

HEARING: July 13, 1962, at the New Post Office and Court House Building, Boston, Mass., before Joint Board No. 231.

No. MC 12804, filed April 13, 1962. Applicant: WEIDNER TRAVEL BUREAU, INC., 83 State Street, Springfield 3, Mass. Applicant's attorney: Francis V. Gogins, 60 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y. For a license (BMC 5) to engage in operations as a *broker* at Springfield, Mass., in arranging for transportation in interstate or foreign commerce, by motor vehicle of *passengers and their baggage*, in the same vehicle, both as individuals and groups, between points in the United States.

HEARING: July 16, 1962, at the New Post Office and Court House Building, Boston, Mass., before Joint Board No. 231.

No. MC 12805, filed April 17, 1962. Applicant: RUTTENBERG TRAVEL SERVICE, 443 Washington Street, Reading, Pa. For a license (BMC 5) to engage in operations as a *broker* at Reading, Pa., in arranging for transportation by motor vehicle, in interstate or foreign commerce of *passengers and their baggage*, in the same vehicle, in groups, between points in the United States.

HEARING: July 9, 1962, at the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission, Harrisburg, Pa., before Joint Board No. 65, or, if the Joint Board waives its right to participate before Examiner Joseph A. Reilly.

APPLICATIONS IN WHICH HANDLING WITHOUT ORAL HEARING HAS BEEN ELECTED

MOTOR CARRIERS OF PROPERTY

No. MC 56661 (Sub-No. 7), filed May 24, 1962. Applicant: LUCAS MOTOR EXPRESS, INC., 1006 East Main Street, P.O. Box 27, Greensburg, Ind. Applicant's attorney: John E. Lesow, 3737 North Meridian Street, Indianapolis 8, Ind. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over regular routes, transporting: *General*

commodities (except those of unusual value, Classes A and B explosives, household goods as defined in *Practices of Motor Common Carriers of Household Goods*, 17 M.C.C. 467, commodities in bulk, and those requiring special equipment), serving Letts and Westport, Ind., located on Indiana Highway 3 south of Greensburg, Ind., as off-route points in connection with carrier's authorized regular-route operations to and from Greensburg, Ind.

No. MC 69274 (Sub-No. 6), filed May 14, 1962. Applicant: M & R TRANSPORTATION CO., INC., 147 Park Street, Akron, Ohio. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over regular routes, transporting: *General commodities* (except those of unusual value, Classes A and B explosives, household goods as defined by the Commission, commodities in bulk, and those requiring special equipment), serving the site of applicant's new terminal located between U.S. Highway 5 and U.S. Highway Alternate 5 approximately fourteen (14) miles north of Hartford, Conn., and thirteen (13) miles south of Springfield, Mass., as an off-route point in connection with applicant's regular route operation.

No. MC 111496 (Sub-No. 6), filed May 24, 1962. Applicant: TWIN CITY-FARGO FREIGHT, INC., 122 Southeast Eighth Street, Minneapolis, Minn. Applicant's attorney: W. E. Hustleby, 1681 Highland Parkway, St. Paul 16, Minn. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over regular routes, transporting: *General commodities* (except those of unusual value, Classes A and B explosives, household goods as defined by the Commission, commodities in bulk, and those requiring special equipment), serving Camp Ripley, Morrison County, Minn., as an intermediate point in connection with applicant's regular-route operations between Little Falls, Minn., and Randall, Minn.

No. MC 115162 (Sub-No. 74), filed May 24, 1962. Applicant: WALTER POOLE, doing business as POOLE TRUCK LINE, Evergreen, Ala. Applicant's attorney: Hugh R. Williams, 3020 West Fairview Avenue, Montgomery 2, Ala. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Lumber*, from points in Marathion, Marinette, Forest, Waupaca, Winnebago, and Wood Counties, Wis., to points in Mississippi, Louisiana and points in Alabama on and south of U.S. Highway 80.

No. MC 115162 (Sub-No. 76), filed May 24, 1962. Applicant: WALTER POOLE, doing business as POOLE TRUCK LINE, Evergreen, Ala. Applicant's attorney: Hugh R. Williams, 3020 West Fairview Avenue, Montgomery 2, Ala. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Lumber*, from points in Berkeley County, W. Va., to points in Alabama on and south of U.S. Highway 80.

No. MC 121140 (Sub-No. 1), filed May 25, 1962. Applicant: STATEWIDE

TRANSPORT, INC., 7103 Folk Street, Boise, Idaho. Applicant's attorney: J. Charles Blanton, Box 1253, Boise, Idaho. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Construction, mining, and logging machinery, equipment and supplies, and heavy hauling* (items of unusual weight, size or dimensions requiring special equipment to load, unload or transport), in furtherance of applicant's authority under the second proviso of section 206(a) (1) of the Interstate Commerce Act to engage in operations in interstate commerce or foreign commerce to the same extent that applicant is authorized to engage in intrastate commerce, to provide that in transporting shipments between points in Idaho south of Boise, on the one hand, and, on the other, points in north Idaho, applicant may travel into the States of Oregon and Washington as may be required by circumstances, and to provide that in transporting shipments between points in eastern Idaho south of Salmon, on the one hand, and, on the other, points in northern Idaho, applicant may travel though the State of Montana as may be required by circumstances.

No. MC 124034 (Sub-No. 6), filed May 23, 1962. Applicant: SCHWERMAN TRUCKING CO. OF N.Y. INC., 620 South 29 Street, Milwaukee 46, Wis. Applicant's attorney: James R. Ziperski (same address as applicant). Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *Dry cement*, in bulk and in packages, from Boston, Mass., to points in Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Maine, Connecticut, and Vermont.

NOTE: Applicant states it holds contract carrier cement authority under MC 117538 and Subs thereto, and, therefore, dual operations may be involved. Applicant further states it is controlled by Schwerman Trucking Co. (approved in Docket MC-F-6963). Schwerman Trucking Co. (Wisconsin parent corporation) also controls Schwerman Trucking Co. of Ohio and Schwerman Co. of Pa., Inc. (approved in Docket No. MC-F-4623) Schwerman Trucking Co. of Indiana, Inc. (approved in MC-F-5793) Schwerman Trucking Co. of Ill., Inc. (approved in MC-F-6124) and Schwerman Trucking Co. of Texas (approved in MC-F-6834).

MOTOR CARRIERS OF PASSENGERS

No. MC 55312 (Sub-No 10), filed May 25, 1962. Applicant: CONTINENTAL TENNESSEE LINES, INC., 418 Fifth Avenue, South, Nashville, Tenn. Applicant's attorney: Warren A. Goff, 315 Continental Avenue, Dallas, Tex. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over regular routes, transporting: *Passengers and their baggage, and express and newspapers* in the same vehicles with passengers, between Hartsville and Lafayette, Tenn., as follows: From Hartsville over Tennessee Highway 25 to junction of Tennessee Highways 25 and 10; thence over Tennessee Highway 10 to Lafayette, serving all intermediate points and returning over the same route.

NOTE: Applicant is a subsidiary of Transcontinental Tennessee Lines, Inc.

PETITION

No. MC 119493 (CORRECTION) (PETITION FOR FORMAL INTERPRETATION), filed February 20, 1961, published FEDERAL REGISTER, issue of May 16, 1962, and republished as corrected this issue. Petitioner: MONKEM COMPANY, INC., Joplin, Mo. Petitioner's attorney: James F. Miller, 500 Board of Trade Building, Kansas City 5, Mo. The notice in the FEDERAL REGISTER, issue of May 16, 1962, indicated that applicant's petition was filed February 20, 1962, in error. The petition was filed February 20, 1961.

APPLICATIONS FOR CERTIFICATES OR PERMITS WHICH ARE TO BE PROCESSED CONCURRENTLY WITH APPLICATIONS UNDER SECTION 5 GOVERNED BY SPECIAL RULE 1.240 TO THE EXTENT APPLICABLE

No. MC 2111 (Sub-No. 7), filed May 22, 1962. Applicant: BRUNO BROTHERS, INC., Felton Road, Norristown, Pa. Authority sought to operate as a *common carrier*, by motor vehicle, over irregular routes, transporting: *General commodities* (except those of unusual value, Classes A and B explosives, household goods as defined by the Commission, commodities in bulk and those requiring special equipment), (1) between Ephrata, Akron, Denver, Terre Hill, New Holland, Adamstown, Hopeland, Lincoln, Stevens, Blue Ball, East Earl, Goodville, Churchtown, Groffdale, Bareville, Farmersville, Brunnerville, Clay, Brickerville, Lexington, Schoeneck, Rothsville, Millway, Leola, Reamstown, Brownstown, Reinholds, Honey Brook, Elverson, Guthriesville, and Morgantown, Pa. (2) Between Ephrata, Akron, Denver, Terre Hill, New Holland, Adamstown, Hopeland, Lincoln, Stevens, Blue Ball, East Earl, Goodville, Churchtown, Groffdale, Bareville, Farmersville, Brunnerville, Clay, Brickerville, Lexington, Schoeneck, Rothsville, Millway, Leola, Reamstown, Brownstown, Reinholds, Honey Brook, Elverson, Guthriesville, and Morgantown, Pa., on the one hand, and, on the other, Philadelphia, Pa. (3) Between Downingtown, Pa., and Ephrata, Pa.

NOTE: This application is filed concurrently with section 5 and directly related with MC-F 8154 published this issue.

APPLICATIONS UNDER SECTIONS 5 AND 210a(b)

The following applications are governed by the Interstate Commerce Commission's special rules governing notice of filing of applications by motor carriers of property or passengers under sections 5(a) and 210a(b) of the Interstate Commerce Act and certain other proceedings with respect thereto (49 CFR 1.240).

MOTOR CARRIERS OF PROPERTY

No. MC-F-8152. Authority sought for purchase by JEFF A. ROBERTSON, an individual, doing business as TOPEKA MOTOR FREIGHT, 705 East Highway 24, Topeka, Kans., of the operating rights of E. A. HOFFMAN (LUCY WRIGHT, EXECUTRIX), doing business as THE GRODICK TRANSFER AND STORAGE CO., 115 South Fourth Street, Atchison, Kans. Applicants' attorney: Jeff A. Robertson, 610 First National Bank

Building, Topeka, Kans. Operating rights sought to be transferred: *Dangerous explosives and general commodities*, excepting, among others, household goods and commodities in bulk, as a *common carrier* over regular routes between Atchison, Kans., and St. Joseph, Mo., and *groceries and alcohol*, between Kansas City, Mo., and Atchison, Kans., serving no intermediate points; and *household goods*, over irregular routes, between Atchison, Kans., and points within 50 miles thereof, on the one hand, and, on the other, points in Kansas and Missouri. Vendee presently holds no operating rights issued by the Interstate Commerce Commission, or operates as a carrier. However, in No. MC-FC 64735 (published in the February 10, 1962 issue of the FEDERAL REGISTER, effective March 7, 1962), transfer to JEFF A. ROBERTSON, doing business as TOPEKA MOTOR FREIGHT, of the interstate operating rights of TOPEKA MOTOR FREIGHT, INC., was approved by the Commission, The Transfer Board. If the transfer is consummated, in compliance with requirements of the order, vendee will have the rights to operate as a *common carrier* in Kansas and Missouri. Application has been filed for temporary authority under section 210 a(b).

No. MC-F-8153. Authority sought for purchase by MIDWEST COAST TRANSPORT, INC., Wilson Terminal Building, P.O. Box 747, Sioux Falls, S. Dak., of the operating rights of NORTHWESTERN TRANSIT, INC. (HARRY A. ASH, TRUSTEE), Michigan City, Ind., and for acquisition by H. LAUREN LEWIS, also of Sioux Falls of control of such rights through the purchase. Applicants' attorneys: Donald L. Stern, 924 City National Bank Building, Omaha 2, Nebr., and Leonard Gesas, 100 West Monroe, Chicago, Ill. Operating rights sought to be transferred: *General commodities*, excepting, among others, household goods and commodities in bulk, as a *common carrier* over regular routes between Chicago, Ill., and Detroit, Mich., between New Buffalo, Mich., and Niles, Mich., between Michigan City, Ind., and South Bend, Ind., serving certain off-route points, between junction U.S. Highway 6 and Indiana Highway 55 and Michigan City, Ind., between Michigan City, Ind., and Valparaiso, Ind., and between Michigan City, Ind., and La Porte, Ind., serving all intermediate points, between Detroit, Mich., and junction U.S. Highway 112 and U.S. Highway 112 By-Pass, serving certain intermediate points, between junction U.S. Highway 20 and Indiana Highway 43 and Lafayette, Ind., serving all intermediate points, and between junction U.S. Highway 421 and Indiana Highway 10 (near San Pierre, Ind.), and North Judson, Ind., serving no intermediate points, and over various alternate routes for operating convenience only; *general commodities*, excepting, among others, commodities in bulk, but not excepting household goods, between junction Michigan Highway 17 and unnumbered highways, and any entrance to Ford Willow Run Plant, between junction U.S. Highway 112 and unnumbered

highways and any entrance to Ford Willow Run Plant, serving no intermediate points, between Detroit, Mich., and junction U.S. Highway 112 and Michigan Highway 17, serving the intermediate point of the Ford Willow Run Plant, east of Ypsilanti, Mich.; and *mining machinery and air compressors* requiring special equipment and handling, over irregular routes between Michigan City, Ind., on the one hand, and, on the other, points in Illinois, Indiana and Michigan. Vendee is authorized to operate as a *common carrier* in South Dakota, Washington, Oregon, Minnesota, Iowa, Utah, California, Nebraska, Nevada, Idaho, Illinois, Missouri, North Dakota, Wisconsin, Montana, Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Colorado, Michigan, Indiana, Ohio, Kentucky, Kansas, Virginia, North Carolina, Arizona, West Virginia, Maryland, and the District of Columbia. Application has been filed for temporary authority under section 210a(b).

No. MC-F-8154. Authority sought for purchase by BRUNO BROTHERS, INC., Felton Road, Norristown, Pa., of the operating rights of WALTER D. WOLF, an individual, doing business as EPH-RATA MOTOR EXPRESS, 353 Duke Street, Ephrata, Pa., and for acquisition by BENJAMIN MATUSOW, and JOSHUA MATUSOW, 103 East Sharpnack Street, Philadelphia, Pa., JANICE L. FORD, 852 Medway Road, Philadelphia, Pa., and JOSEPH B. ATKINSON, CHARLES H. ATKINSON, and ELIZABETH M. ATKINSON, all of 4222 Main Street, Philadelphia 27, Pa., of control of such rights through the purchase. Applicants' attorney: Morris J. Winokur, 1920 Two Penn Center Plaza, Philadelphia 2, Pa. Operating rights sought to be transferred: Operations under the Second Proviso of section 206(a)(1) of the Interstate Commerce Act in the State of Pennsylvania, covering the transportation of *general commodities*, excepting, among others, household goods and commodities in bulk, as a *common carrier* over irregular routes between Ephrata, Akron, Denver, Terre Hill, New Holland, Adamstown, Hope-land, Lincoln, Stevens, Blue Ball, East Earl, Goodville, Churchtown, Groffdale, Bareville, Farmersville, Brunnerville, Clay, Brickerville, Lexington, Schoeneck, Rothsville, Millway, Leola, Reamstown, Brownstown, Reinholds, Honey Brook, Elverson, Guthriesville, Morgantown, Pa., between the points named above, on the one hand, and, on the other, Philadelphia, Pa., and between Downingtown, Pa., and Ephrata, Pa. Vendee is authorized to operate as a *common carrier* in Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, New York, New Jersey, and the District of Columbia. Application has been filed for temporary authority under section 210a(b).

NOTE: No. MC-2111 Sub 7 is a matter directly related.

No. MC-F-8155. Authority sought for control by HELEN E. SMITH AND LAWRENCE E. SMITH, 646 Coffeen Street, Watertown, N.Y., of PULP TRANSPORT, LTD., 644 Coffeen Street,

Watertown, N.Y. Applicants' attorney: Francis E. Barrett, Jr., 25 Bryant Avenue, East Milton 86, Mass. Operating rights sought to be controlled: Authority applied for by PULP TRANSPORT, LTD., in pending application (Docket No. MC-124024 Sub-1) covering the transportation of *wood pulp*, as a *contract carrier* over irregular routes, under a continuing contract with Thurso Pulp and Paper Company, Thurso, Canada, from the International Boundary Line between the United States and Canada at or near Ogdensburg, N.Y., to points in New York. HELEN E. SMITH AND LAWRENCE E. SMITH hold no authority from this Commission. However, they are the principal stockholders of W. T. BYRNS MOTOR EXPRESS, INC., 646 Coffeen Street, Watertown, N.Y., which is authorized to operate as a *common carrier* in New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Delaware, Rhode Island, Maryland, Illinois, Michigan, Ohio, and the District of Columbia. Application has not been filed for temporary authority under section 210a(b).

No. MC-F-8156. Authority sought for control by ALVIN R. HOLMES, an individual, doing business as HOLMES TRANSPORTATION SERVICE and/or JONES EXPRESS, 214 Shrewsbury Street, Worcester, Mass., of JOHNSON MOTOR TRANSPORT, 75-81 St. John Street, Portland, Maine. Applicants' attorney: Kenneth B. Williams, 111 State St., Boston 9, Mass. Operating rights sought to be controlled: *General commodities*, excepting, among others, household goods and commodities in bulk, as a *common carrier* over regular routes between Portland, Maine, and Boston, Mass., serving all intermediate and certain off-route points, between Portland, Maine, and Bangor, Maine, serving all intermediate routes, and over an alternate route for operating convenience only; *paper and paper products*, over irregular routes, from Brunswick, Portland, South Windham, Pejepscot Mills, Bucksport, and Mechanic Falls, Maine, to Northbridge, Fitchburg, Springfield, Watchussets, North Leominster, Gardiner, Mount Tom, New Bedford and Shrewsbury, Mass., from Portland, South Windham, Cumberland Mills, Sanford, and Bucksport, Maine, to Northumberland, Berlin, Manchester, Rochester, Milton, Milford, and Concord, N.H., and from Bucksport, South Windham, and Brunswick, Maine, to Pawtucket, Providence, and Woonsocket, R.I., *cardboard partitions*, from Bucksport, Mechanic Falls, Augusta, Pejepscot Mills, and Rumford, Maine, to Worcester, Shrewsbury, Holyoke, Springfield, Webster, North Adams, and Pittsfield, Mass., *cookies*, from North Adams, Mass., to Lewiston, Maine, and *general commodities*, with the exceptions listed above, between certain points in Maine, on the one hand, and, on the other, points in Massachusetts within 25 miles of Boston, including Boston. ALVIN R. HOLMES, doing business as HOLMES TRANSPORTATION SERVICE and/or JONES EXPRESS, is authorized to operate as a *common carrier* in Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Vermont,

Rhode Island, Connecticut, Maine, New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania. Application has been filed for temporary authority under section 210a(b).

No. MC-F-8157. Authority sought for purchase by GLENN MCCLENDON TRUCKING COMPANY, INC., Opelika Road, Lafayette, Ala., of a portion of the operating rights of NILSON MOTOR EXPRESS, INC., Meyers P.O. Box 6038, Hibernia Heights, Charleston, S.C., and for acquisition by GLENN MCCLENDON and WALTER MCCLENDON, both of Lafayette, Ala., of control of such rights through the purchase. Applicants' attorneys: D. H. Markstein, Jr., 818 Massey Building, Birmingham 3, Ala., and Frank Graham, 707 Security Federal Building, Columbia, S.C. Operating rights sought to be transferred: *New beverage bottles and glass food containers*, as a *common carrier* over irregular routes from Laurens, S.C., to points in Kentucky, Mississippi, New Jersey, and Tennessee, *glass containers*, from Laurens, S.C., to all points in Alabama, except Montgomery, Florence, Decatur, Gadsden, and Birmingham, all points in Louisiana, except New Orleans, Gretna, and Destrehan, all points in Arkansas, all points in Pennsylvania, except Philadelphia, and all points in New York, except those in the New York, N.Y., Commercial Zone, and from Laurens, S.C., to points in Texas, and *asphalt and asbestos roofing and roofing materials, and asphalt and asbestos siding*, from New Orleans, La., to points in North Carolina and South Carolina. Vendee is authorized to operate as a *common carrier* in Florida, Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, North Carolina, Tennessee, and South Carolina. Application has not been filed for temporary authority under section 210a(b).

No. MC-F-8158. Authority sought for purchase by THE SHORT LINE, INC., Court House Square, Newport, R.I., of the operating rights and property of JOHNSON BUS LINES, INC., 1099 Social Street, Woonsocket, R.I., and for acquisition by GEORGE M. SAGE, also of Newport, of control of such rights and property through the purchase. Applicants' attorney: S. Harrison Kahn, 1110-1114 Investment Building, Washington 5, D.C. Operating rights sought to be transferred: *Passengers* and their baggage, and express, mail, and newspapers, in the same vehicle with passengers, and *baggage* of passengers in a separate vehicle, as a *common carrier* over regular routes between the Town of Millbury, Mass., and Uxbridge, Mass., between junction Massachusetts Highway 146 and unnumbered highway (Purgatory Road), and Whitinsville, Mass., between Millville, Mass., and North Smithfield, R.I., and between Providence, R.I., and Fitchburg, Mass., serving all intermediate points, *passengers* and their baggage, and express, mail, and newspapers, in the same vehicle with passengers, between Providence, R.I., and Worcester, Mass., between Boston, Mass., and Woonsocket, R.I., between Hopkinton, Mass., and Wrentham, Mass., and between Medway, Mass., and Woonsocket,

R.I., serving all intermediate points; *passengers* and their baggage, and mail, in the same vehicle with passengers, between North Providence, R.I., and Narragansett Park, Pawtucket, R.I., serving all intermediate points, over an alternate route for operating convenience only; *passengers* and their baggage, restricted to traffic originating in the territory and at the points indicated, in charter operations, over irregular routes from points in Massachusetts; Brattleboro, and Manchester, Vt., Old Orchard Beach, Maine, Manchester, Keene, and Washington, N.H., and Syracuse and Oswego, N.Y., to points in Massachusetts, Vermont, New Hampshire, Maine, Connecticut, Rhode Island, New York, Virginia, North Carolina, the Great Smoky Mountains National Park (in Tennessee), Asbury Park, and Atlantic City, N.J., Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, and Harrisburg, Pa., and the District of Columbia, and *passengers* and their baggage, in the same vehicle with passengers, in special operations, for the purpose of participating in Beano and Bingo games, beginning and ending at Framingham, Holliston, Medway, Marlboro, Southboro, Hopkinton, Milford, and Franklin, Mass., and extending to Manville and Central Falls, R.I. Vendee is authorized to operate as a *common carrier* in Rhode Island, Massachusetts, and Connecticut. Application has been filed for temporary authority under section 210a(b).

No. MC-F-8159. Authority sought for control by EDWARD M. RUDE CARRIER CORP., RFD No. 1, Falling Waters, W. Va., of WEST VIRGINIA MOTOR EXPRESS, INC., Clarksburg, W. Va., and for acquisition by EDWARD M. RUDE, also of Falling Waters of control of WEST VIRGINIA MOTOR EXPRESS, INC., through the acquisition by EDWARD M. RUDE CARRIER CORP. Applicant's attorney: Arch M. Cantrall, 701 Goff Building, Clarksburg, W. Va. Operating rights sought to be controlled: *Glass*, as a *common carrier* over irregular routes from Clarksburg, W. Va., to New York, N.Y., and Cincinnati, Ohio, *groceries*, from Cincinnati, Ohio, to Clarksburg, W. Va., *glass and glassware*, from Clarksburg, Fairmount, Weston, and Sistersville, W. Va., to Baltimore, Md., Washington, D.C., Philadelphia, Pa., and points within 25 miles of Philadelphia, *linoleum*, from Lancaster, Pa., to Clarksburg, W. Va., and points in West Virginia within 50 miles thereof, *sugar and groceries*, from Philadelphia, Pa., and Baltimore, Md., and points within 25 miles of each, to Clarksburg, W. Va., and points in West Virginia within 50 miles thereof, *glass and glass products*, from Clarksburg, and Fairmount, W. Va., to certain points in Pennsylvania, Maryland, and Virginia, *groceries and grocery store merchandise*, from Westminster and New Windsor, Md., and Littlestown, Pa., to Clarksburg, W. Va., and points in West Virginia within 50 miles thereof, *seeds and spray materials*, from Baltimore, Md., to Clarksburg, W. Va., *beer*, from Bellaire, Ohio, to Clarksburg, W. Va., *empty beer containers*, from Clarksburg, W. Va., to Bellaire, Ohio, *general commodities*, excepting, among others,

household goods and commodities in bulk, between points in West Virginia, on the one hand, and, on the other, Clarksburg, W. Va., and Cumberland, Md., *beer and empty beer containers*, between Clarksburg, W. Va., and Cincinnati, Ohio, and *cork, felt base floor covering or tiling, asphalt composition tiling, and supplies and equipment* used in the installation of such commodities and linoleum, from Lancaster, Pa., to Clarksburg, W. Va., and points in W. Va., within 50 miles of Clarksburg. EDWARD M. RUDE CARRIER CORP., is authorized to operate as a *contract carrier* in Pennsylvania, New Jersey, West Virginia, Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, Ohio, Kentucky, Tennessee, North Carolina, and the District of Columbia. Application has not been filed for temporary authority under section 210a(b).

By the Commission.

[SEAL]

HAROLD D. McCoy,
Secretary.

[F.R. Doc. 62-5467; Filed, June 5, 1962;
8:48 a.m.]

[Investigation and Suspension Docket No.
7839]

HOLDING OF LOADED GRAIN CARS AT HOLDING POINT WHEN DES- TINED TO TEXAS GULF PORTS FOR EXPORT

MAY 31, 1962.

Notice is hereby given that the Interstate Commerce Commission, Washington, D.C., in Investigation and Suspension Docket No. 7839, has suspended to and including December 23, 1962, the operation of certain schedules published in Supplements 2, 3, 4, and 5, to tariff I.C.C. 957 of Texas-Louisiana Freight Bureau, Agent, Dallas, Tex., and has instituted an investigation into and concerning the lawfulness of the rates and charges, rules, regulations, and practices contained in said schedules.

The suspended schedules propose to establish a new provision permitting the holding of loaded cars of bulk grain, bulk flax seed or soy beans, for export at Texas Gulf Ports, at an available hold point short of destination, and in that event notice shall not be given until car has arrived at destination. In such instances, the free time to be computed from the first 7:00 a.m. after notice is sent or given.

Any persons interested in any of the matters contained in this investigation may, on or before July 2, 1962, file a letter with this Commission either supporting or opposing the matters under investigation. Upon expiration of the above date, the proceeding will be assigned for either oral hearing or for handling under modified procedure described in Rules 1.45 to 1.54 of the Commission's general rules of practice.

[SEAL]

HAROLD D. McCoy,
Secretary.

[F.R. Doc. 62-5469; Filed, June 5, 1962;
8:48 a.m.]

FOURTH SECTION APPLICATIONS
FOR RELIEF

JUNE 1, 1962.

Protests to the granting of an application must be prepared in accordance with Rule 40 of the general rules of practice (49 CFR 1.40) and filed within 15 days from the date of publication of this notice in the FEDERAL REGISTER.

LONG-AND-SHORT HAUL

FSA No. 37770: *Scrap iron or steel from Muskegon, Mich., to Hamilton, Ontario.* Filed by Traffic Executive Association-Eastern Railroads, Agent (E.R. No. 2622), for interested rail carriers. Rates on scrap iron or steel (not copper clad), as described in the application, in carloads, from Muskegon, Mich., to Hamilton, Ontario, Canada.

Grounds for relief: Water competition.

Tariff: Supplement 81 to Grand Trunk Western Railroad Company tariff I.C.C. A-100.

FSA No. 37771: *Alcohols from Geismar, La., to Seneca, Ill.* Filed by O. W. South, Jr., Agent (No. A4195), for interested rail carriers. Rates on diethylene glycol and proprietary anti-freeze preparations, in tank-car loads, from Geismar, La., to Seneca, Ill.

Grounds for relief: Carrier competition.

Tariff: Supplement 308 to Southern Freight Association tariff I.C.C. 400.

FSA No. 37772: *Cement and related articles from Castle Hayne, N.C.* Filed by O. W. South, Jr., Agent (No. A4196), for interested rail carriers. Rates on cement and related articles, as described in the application, in carloads, from Castle Hayne, N.C., to points in southern territory, also Ohio and Mississippi River crossings and points in Virginia and West Virginia.

Grounds for relief: Market competition.

Tariff: Supplement 44 to Southern Freight Association tariff I.C.C. S-157.

By the Commission.

[SEAL]

HAROLD D. MCCOY,
Secretary.

[F.R. Doc. 62-5463; Filed, June 5, 1962;
8:47 a.m.]

CUMULATIVE CODIFICATION GUIDE—JUNE

The following numerical guide is a list of the parts of each title of the Code of Federal Regulations affected by documents published to date during June.

3 CFR	Page	18 CFR	Page	49 CFR	Page
EXECUTIVE ORDERS:		3-----	5331	95-----	5141
11023-----	5131	PROPOSED RULES:		187-----	5142
PRESIDENTIAL DOCUMENTS OTHER		154-----	5201	PROPOSED RULES:	
THAN PROCLAMATIONS AND EXECU-				72-----	5143
TIVE ORDERS:		19 CFR		73-----	5143
Letter, Apr. 23, 1929 (super-		8-----	5190	74-----	5146
seded by EO 11023)-----	5131	12-----	5190	77-----	5147
5 CFR		21 CFR		78-----	5147
6-----	5243, 5329	121-----	5258		
6 CFR		PROPOSED RULES:			
421-----	5243	29-----	5198		
443-----	5248, 5251	26 CFR			
7 CFR		PROPOSED RULES:			
51-----	5253	20-----	5268		
722-----	5254	25-----	5268		
775-----	5329	27 CFR			
811-----	5255	5-----	5259		
813-----	5255	28 CFR			
908-----	5187	0-----	5162		
910-----	5187	32 CFR			
912-----	5329	590-----	5259		
915-----	5135	591-----	5259		
916-----	5256	592-----	5260		
917-----	5256, 5329, 5330	593-----	5261		
922-----	5187	595-----	5261		
980-----	5330	596-----	5261		
987-----	5257	598-----	5261		
1133-----	5136	600-----	5263		
1195-----	5331	602-----	5264		
PROPOSED RULES:		606-----	5265		
1001-----	5335	825-----	5331		
1003-----	5195	890-----	5331		
1006-----	5335	36 CFR			
1007-----	5335	PROPOSED RULES:			
1014-----	5335	7-----	5195		
1015-----	5335	38 CFR			
1016-----	5195	3-----	5141		
9 CFR		39 CFR			
PROPOSED RULES:		112-----	5265		
16-----	5195	151-----	5265		
17-----	5195	43 CFR			
18-----	5195	PUBLIC LAND ORDERS:			
12 CFR		125-----	5334		
271-----	5188	948-----	5334		
272-----	5188	2686-----	5266		
13 CFR		2687-----	5266		
PROPOSED RULES:		2688-----	5266		
107-----	5271	2689-----	5334		
111-----	5219	45 CFR			
14 CFR		PROPOSED RULES:			
22-----	5331	301-----	5151		
507-----	5137	46 CFR			
514-----	5137, 5138	146-----	5279		
600-----	5257	147-----	5279		
609-----	5179	47 CFR			
PROPOSED RULES:		2-----	5334		
241-----	5268	PROPOSED RULES:			
600-----	5269, 5341	2-----	5345-5347		
601-----	5270, 5341	3-----	5347		
608-----	5341	9-----	5345-5347		
16 CFR		15-----	5201		
13-----	5139, 5140, 5258				
17 CFR					
231-----	5190				
271-----	5190				
PROPOSED RULES:					
240-----	5204				

Now Available

CFR SUPPLEMENTS

(As of January 1, 1962)

The following Supplements are now available:

Title 6-----	\$2.00
Titles 10-13-----	1.25
Title 24 (Revised)-----	3.00
Title 46 (Parts 150-end)-----	1.25
Title 47 (Parts 1-29)-----	1.50

Previously announced: Title 3, 1954-1958 Compilation (\$4.00); 1961 Supplement to Title 3 (\$0.60); Title 5 (\$0.50); Title 7, Parts 1-50 (\$0.65); Parts 51-52 (\$0.70); Parts 53-209 (\$0.60); Parts 210-399 (\$0.40); Parts 900-944 (Revised) (\$1.00); Parts 945-980 (Revised) (\$1.00); Parts 981-999 (Revised) (\$0.55); Parts 1000-1029 (Revised) (\$1.00); Parts 1030-1059 (Revised) (\$1.50); Parts 1060-1089 (Revised) (\$1.00); Parts 1090-1119 (Revised) (\$1.25); Parts 1120 to end (Revised) (\$1.00); Title 8 (\$0.50); Title 9 (\$0.65); Title 14, Parts 1-19 (Revised) (\$2.50); Parts 20-199 (Revised) (\$1.75); Parts 200-399 (Revised) (\$1.00); Parts 400-599 (Revised) (\$0.65); Parts 600 to end (Revised) (\$0.70); Title 15 (\$1.25); Title 16 (\$0.45); Title 17 (\$1.00); Title 18 (\$0.35); Title 19 (\$0.35); Title 20 (\$0.40); Title 21 (\$2.25); Titles 22-23 (\$0.55); Title 25 (\$0.50); Title 26, Part 1 (§§ 1.0-1-1.400) (\$0.40); Part 1 (§§ 1.401-1.860) (\$0.55); Part 1 (§ 1.861 to end) to Part 19 (\$0.30); Parts 20-29 (\$0.30); Parts 30-39 (\$0.30); Parts 40-169 (\$0.50); Parts 170-299 (\$0.50); Parts 300-499 (\$0.35); Parts 500-599 (\$0.30); Parts 600 to end (\$0.30); Title 27 (\$0.30); Titles 28-29 (\$2.25); Titles 30-31 (\$1.00); Title 32, Parts 1-39 (\$0.50); Parts 40-399 (\$0.40); Parts 400-589 (Revised) (\$3.50); Parts 800-999 (\$0.50); Parts 1000-1099 (\$1.75); Title 32A (\$0.75); Title 35 (\$0.30); Title 36 (\$0.35); Title 37 (\$0.30); Title 38 (\$1.25); Title 39 (Revised) (\$5.25); Titles 40-41 (Revised) (\$1.75); Title 42 (\$0.40); Title 43 (\$1.25); Title 44 (\$0.30); Title 45 (\$0.45); Title 46, Parts 1-145 (\$1.50); Parts 146-149 (1961 Supplement 2) (\$1.25); Title 47, Parts 30 to end (\$0.40); Title 49, Parts 1-70 (\$1.00); Parts 71-90 (\$1.25); Parts 91-164 (\$0.55); Parts 165 to end (\$0.30); Title 50 (\$0.40)

Order from Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C.

